The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A.

INGRAM BYWATER, M.A.

AND

HENRY JACKSON, LITT. D.

VOL. XXII.

London and Cambridge:

MACMILLAN AND CO.

DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO. CAMBRIDGE.

1894

14248

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

CONTENTS.

No. XLIII.

PAGE

The Shortening of Long Syllables in Plautus. W. M. Lindsay . 1

The Prosody of Mico the Levite. Robinson Ellis 9

Euripides. Two Suggestions on the Iphigenia in Aulis. Robinson Ellis 22

A Suggestion on Prop. II. 34, 29, 30. Robinson Ellis . . . 24

Bentley's Notes on the Odyssey. Arthur Platt 26

Iphigenia and EKATOMBH. Arthur Platt 43

On the Manuscripts of Aeschylus. Chr. Brennan 49

Propert. IV. 3. 35—38. Robinson Ellis 72

Ennius Ann. 307—310. Robinson Ellis 73

Scaliger's Unpublished Emendations in Nonius (*continued*). Henry Nettleship 74

The Manuscripts of Propertius (*continued*). A. E. Housman . . 84

The Chronology of the Corinthian War. G. E. Underhill . . 129

On Book XV of Ovid's Metamorphoses. J. P. Postgate . . . 144

No. XLIV.

	PAGE
On the Composition of some Greek Manuscripts. T. W. Allen	157
Visio Pauli. John E. B. Mayor	184
Bentley's Notes on the Odyssey (*continued*). Arthur Platt	198
The Chronology of Xenophon's Hellenica, 387 to 362 B.C. G. E. Underhill	222
Two New MSS. in the British Museum. F. G. Kenyon	238
On some Passages from the Poetae Scenici. Hugh Macnaghten	262
Note on the Fourth Pythian. R. D. Archer-Hind	267
Some New Papyri from Apollonopolis. B. P. Grenfell	268
A Collation of from Two to Six MSS. of the Revelation of St John. W. H. Simcox	285
Annotations on Valerius Flaccus. J. P. Postgate	307
The Escorial Excerpts from *Aetna*. Robinson Ellis	314

THE JOURNAL

Correction for page 22, *Vol.* XXII, *No.* 43.

EURIPIDES *I. A.* 373.

In my note on this v. to which Professor Robinson Ellis does me the honour to refer on p. 22 of No. 43 of this Journal, the word χείους is, I greatly regret to say, a mistake for χρείους.

E. B. ENGLAND.

whence the Romance syncopated forms of *ver(ĕ)cundia*, Ital. vergogna, Span. verguenza, Fr. vergogne etc. (cf. *Quaest. Gramm. Bern.* p. 186 H.). The Christian poets also use, not only scansions like *abўssus* (ἄβυσσος) (cf. *ibid.* p. 177. 4 H.) (*e.g.* Paul. Nol. 19, 651; 35, 228), but also like *erĕmus* (ἔρημος, beside ἐρῆμος) (*e.g.* Prud. *Psych.* 372; *Cath.* 5. 89), whence the Romance forms, Ital. eremo and ermo, Span. yermo, O. Fr. erme etc.; but such shortenings, which are natural enough at a time when the distinction between the long and the short quantity of a vowel was beginning to disappear, are not likely to have been tolerated in good Latin pronunciation at the time of the Early Dramatists. It is true that the shortening of a final naturally long vowel is allowed by Ennius and the Hexameter

poets, while the shortening of a final syllable long by position is not, e.g. *putŏ*, not *legŭnt, dixerŏ* (Hor. *S.* I. 4. 104), not *dixerŭnt.* But this is merely because another factor was at work in the weakening of the former, namely the law of Latin pronunciation that a long vowel (final or not) should be shortened in hiatus, e.g. *putŏ hoc, dixerŏ id,* like *illĭus, pĭus, prăĕustus, prĕhendo,* just as in *amăt, amŏr, patĕt,* contrasted with *amās, patēs, palūs,* there was the shortening influence of the final consonant, the same as has reduced the long vowel of our 'node' to a half-long vowel in the word 'note'. *Pudĭcitiam* is the reading of the Palatine MSS. in *Amph.* 930, *Epid.* 405, passages for which the evidence of the Palimpsest is wanting (*Epid.* 541 is anapaestic, with *pudīcitiam*); *propĭnare amĭcissumam amīcitiam* is suggested for a line in an anapaestic passage, *Pseud.* 1263, by the MSS. (P) with their *propinare micissim amicitiam,* but Goetz prints *uicissim,* while Ritschl made the line bacchiac *propīnare amīcissumam; amĭcitiam Men.* 846 is very doubtful; *perĭturissume Rud.* 1375 should be *periurissume; peculatus* and *depeculatus,* in the three passages in which they occur in Plautus (*Pers.* 555; *Cist.* 1. 1. 70; *Epid.* 520), have short *u,* but whether these words had originally the long *u* of *pecūlium* is questionable; in *Aul.* 516 *sem(i)sonarii,* not *semisŏnarii,* a line of doubtful genuineness (A vowel before a Mute and Liquid, or *qu*[1], cannot well play the part of a 'brevis brevians' (Klotz in Bursian's *Jahresber.* 19, p. 238); surely not a vowel preceding *s* for Greek ζ). The strongest example is *Clutĕmestra* Κλυταιμήστρα) in Livius Andronicus *Trag.* 11 R.; though with Greek loanwords there is always a possibility of false Analogy, such as produced *aurĭchalcum* (classical *orĭchalcum*) from ὀρείχαλκος (cf. also Gk. Κυναίγειρος and Κυνέγειρος). The Early Dramatists do not shorten, after a short monosyllable (or elided disyllable), the prepositions *in, con* in compounds,

[1] *quo-*, pronounced *-co-* (cf. *quom* for *com, cum,* the Preposition), would not offer the same resistance; hence *loquŏr, sequŏr.* In *Aul.* 715 read *obsecro ego vos,* the order required by Kellerhoff's rule (*Stud. Stud.* II 51). *Putrĕfacit* would hardly be allowed by Plautus, though Ovid has *putrĕfacta, liquĕfiunt. Probrĭ* of *Bacch.* 1167 seems to require investigation. (Shall we make *probrĭperlecebrae* one word?)

where *i*, *o* were naturally long, viz. where *n* is followed by *s* or *f*, e.g. *īnsanus*, *īnfelix* (cf. Cic. *Or.* 48 § 159). (In Plaut. *Stich.* 493 the first syllable of *infumatis* should be scanned long, not short; *ĭnsanit* in *Cist.* fol. 238^{v} 1 Stud. will hardly be defended on the evidence of A alone, which seems to give *hercle híc ĭnsanít miser* as the ending of an iambic line; *Pseud.* 194 is bacchiac with *īnsidias.*) Nor are other long initials shortened. In *Rud.* 913 the alliteration requires the order: *neque piscium pondo ūllam.* In *ornare* the *ŏ*, preceding *rn*, had the quality, not the quantity, of a long *o*, like the *ŏ* preceding *nd* in *frondes* (also written *frundes*) etc.

The small number and doubtful character of these examples of shortening a naturally long syllable by the Breves Breviantes Law stand in marked contrast with the examples of shortening a syllable long by position. *Volŭptatis* (with the other Cases), *volŭptarius* etc. are common scansions in the Early Dramatists; and *volŭntatis*, *juvĕntutis*, *gubĕrnare* and *gubĕrnator*, *egĕstatis*, *venŭstatis*, *supĕllectilis* come next in order of frequency. The normal scansion in the Dramatists of all these second syllables long by position is that of classical poetry; the shortening of them is however a licence which is readily allowed, when the exigencies of metre demand. There is no indication that particular groups of consonants lent themselves to this shortening more than others, though more instances occur before *st*, *str*, *nt*, *pt*, *ll*, *ct* than before others. Sometimes the consonants are divided between the syllables, as *r* | *n*, *n* | *t*; sometimes they are included in the same syllable, as | *pt*, | *st*. Double consonants, as *ll*, *ss* (e.g. *vicĭssatim*), *nn* (e.g. *per-ănnonam*) allow the shortening with no more nor less readiness than other consonant-groups.

That Prepositions had a tendency to be weakened in a Compound is perhaps indicated by words like *ŏmitto* (for **ommitto*, *ob-mitto*. Contrast *āmitto* for **ammitto*); *rĕcido*, *rĕlatus*, *rĕduco* etc. beside earlier *reccido*, *rellatus*, *redduco* etc.; so that shortenings, like *in ŏcculto Capt.* 83, *tib(i)-ŏptemperem Most.* 896, *quíd ăbstulisti Aul.* 645, occupy to some extent a position by themselves. *In-ŏccúlto* etc. go naturally into the same class with *volŭptátis*, *adŏptatus* (whence *adŏptaticium*

Poen. 1045); but cases like *quíd ăbstulísti*, where the accent does not fall on the second syllable of the Compound, should be classed with the instances, quoted by Klotz pp. 69 sqq., of pairs of monosyllables, like *quíd ăb sodáli*. For the separableness of a Preposition in a Compound is shewn not only by the usage of Tmesis in the old literature (e.g. *disque tulissent Trin.* 833), but also by the fact (mentioned by Buchhold *de Paromoeoseos usu*, p. 47), that Plautus allows Alliteration with the first syllable of the second element of a prepositional Compound, e.g. *Merc.* 384 *s*olus *s*e in consilium *s*euocat, when that syllable is accented. (When the initial syllable of the Compound has the accent, or the ictus, it alone has the power of alliterating, e.g. *Epid.* 256 calidi conducibilis consili.) *Tibi ăddam Epid.* 474 is on a par with *pol ětsi Aul.* 421. But though we may scan *quid ĕxprobras Trin.* 318, with a prepositional Compound, it does not follow that we may scan *quod hŏstica Capt.* 246; nor does *tibi ăddam* give a sanction for *per hŏrtum Stich.* 614.

Dr Klotz thinks that any bacchiac trisyllables with the last syllable elided, e.g. *profect(o)*, *bibend(um)*, *harund(o)*, may be treated as iambic disyllables, and shorten their second, now become their final, syllable. He has certainly failed to adduce strong enough evidence for the shortening of a naturally long syllable in this way, e.g. *Aul.* 599 *Ĕrĭl(e) imperium edíscat* (in *Pseud.* 168 read: *introbite...celebra*); and even his instances of syllables long by position are not altogether satisfactory. *Profĕcto* (a rare scansion, Brix ad *Mil.* 186. The word *profecto* cannot stand, as it is often said to do, for *prō facto*) may possibly be correctly written **profico* (*profecto* is wrongly given in the MSS (P) in *Truc.* 495 for *praefica*, in *Pseud.* 256 for *proh*(?)). *Scelĕstus* is changed by Fleckeisen (*Neue Jahrb.* 1891) to *scelerus*, though in *Most.* 504, *scelĕstae sunt aedes*, the shortening is satisfactorily explained by the accentuation *scelestaé-sunt;* so *molestaé-sunt Mil.* 69 (Skutsch *Forsch.* I. p. 108), and perhaps *modĕsti-sint Trin.* 831 (anap.), *necŭnquám-litem Poen.* 489, just as *voluptas* has the second syllable shortened in *voluptás-mea.*

The alleged cases of shortening in the penultima of a Superlative, e.g. *simillumae Asin.* 241, I have treated in the *Classical Review* VI. p. 342. In the trochaic line of the *Asinaria*

we should read not *pórtitorum símillumae sunt* but *pórtorum simíllumae sunt*, the first word being the (Plautine) Gen. Pl. of *portus* (cf. *versorum* Laber. 55 R.), or a by-form of *portitorum*, like *portorium* for *port(it)orium*. The mere ictus of the verse can hardly have had the power of shortening a syllable (as *Philŏxéne salve Bacch.* 1106 (anap.)). Even in anapaestic metre where the ictus tramples rough-shod over the accent of the words, it does not lengthen a final *s* in 'position,' in lines like *Trin.* 827 *usŭs sum in alto;* Att. *Trag.* 534 R *dictŭs Prometheus* (cf. *Epid.* 541). The impossibility of scanning a bacchiac trisyllable as an anapaestic, e.g. *senĕcta* (unnecessarily so scanned in *Most.* 217), unless when the natural accent of the word precedes or follows the shortened syllable (e.g. *senĕctán Cas.* 240 (anap.); *pĕrĭnd(e) Stich.* 520 (cf. Serv. ad *Aen.* VI. 743 *éxinde;* Prisc. XV. 9 p. 67 *déinde, súbinde, périnde); Philĭppus* (Gk. Φίλιππος), and perhaps *tálĕntum* (Gk. τάλαντον); with the probably foreign word *sátĕllites* and possibly *ságĭtta*), is well seen in an anapaestic line, *Poen.* 1188, beginning *Rebus mis agundis.* To secure an anapaest for the second foot, Plautus could not use the Plural of the Possessive, *Rebús mēis ágŭndis*, or *Rebŭs meis ágŭndis*, but had to avail himself of the rare Gen. Sing. of the Personal Pronoun *mĭs agúndis* (The quantity of *mĭs* is shewn by Enn. *A.* 145 M. *ingens cura mĭs cum concordibus aequiperare*, on which see Prisc. XIII. p. 3 K.; *tis* on the other hand had long *i*, if the Palatine MSS. are right in Plaut. *Mil.* 1033 *quia tīs egeat*, an anapaestic line. Should we read *quia tĭs ea egeat?*). In the line of the *Poenulus* the Palatine MSS. have faithfully preserved *mĭs*, while the Palimpsest has altered it to the more familiar *meis.* The trisyllabic (dactylic) form of *avunculus* used by Plautus does not imply shortening of the second syllable. It is a peculiarity of the vocalic consonant *v* to drop out between two vowels irrespective of their quantity e.g. *di(v)inus, obli(v)iscor.*

That there should be MS. readings which offer difficulties, e.g. *Poen.* 922 *ero ŭni* (I need hardly add *Stich.* 165 *cŏtĭdie*), and other examples quoted in the books of Klotz and C. F. Müller, is only to be expected, considering the state of the text of Plautus; but I think that an unprejudiced inspection of

Plautine versification, as a whole, will confirm these two rules:

(1) that no syllable was shortened in the metre of the Dramatists, which was not shortened (partially or completely) in the ordinary pronunciation of their time[1].

(2) that a naturally long vowel was never shortened by the Law of Breves Breviantes, unless in a final syllable.

The usage of Lucilius with regard to the Breves Breviantes Law is discussed by Dr Skutsch in the Rheinisches Museum, 1893, XLVIII. p. 303. He finds in Lucilius' iambic and trochaic metres six examples of the shortening of a syllable long by position:

Lucil. 27. 20 M. fácit idem quod ĭllí qui inscriptum ex pórtu exportant clánculum.

27. 11. re ín secunda tóllere animos, ét ĭn mala demíttere.

27. 40. árdum misĕrrimum átque infelix lígnum sabucúm uocant.

28. 46. Sócraticum quiddám tyranno mísisse Arĭstippum aútumant.

29. 90. únde dómŭm uix rédeat uixque hoc éxuat se....

29. 96. híc me ubi uidit, súppalpatur, cápŭt scabit, pedĕs legit.

Of these the second and fourth are easily removed by omitting *et* in the second, and by reading *misse* in the fourth. In the fifth, as Dr Skutsch himself remarks, we may scan *únd(e) domúm uix.* The last is a conjectural emendation of the MSS, which rather point to Mueller's reading:

híc me ubi uidit, súbblanditur, pálpatur, capút scabit, pĕdes legit,

[1] To the evidence, cited in the first part of this article, of the operation of the Breves Breviantes Law in the actual pronunciation of the words *cavillator*, *ministerium*, *calefacere*, and *ave*, may be added, for the last of these words, the story in Phaedrus *App.* 21 of the man who mistook for this salutation the caw of a crow; and for the similar Imperative *cave*, Cicero's story (*Div.* 2. 40) of Crassus mistaking *Cauneas* (*sc.* ficus vendo) for *cave ne eas*; also the spelling *causis* for *cave sis* in Juvenal 9. 120. Servius (ad *Aen.* 6. 779) says that *vidĕn* was the pronunciation of his time.

though the metre of the last half of the first line of this couplet is certainly as ungraceful as the subject. The third example I have already treated in the Classical Review VI 343, where I have tried to shew that a scansion like *misĕrrimum* would not be tolerated even by the Dramatists. The first hand of that excellent MS. of Nonius, the Harleian, gives in this line not *miserrimum*, but *miserinum*, which Mueller changes to *miserulum*. It is possible that *miserīnum* is right, for Ullmann in a recent number of the Romanische Forschungen (7. 190) quotes *miserina* from a Roman inscription (Bull. Comm. Arch. di Roma, 1888, 37), a form which he regards as the foretype of Italian adjectives in -ino like bellino, pochino.

In Lucilius' hexameters we have an example of the Breves Breviantes Law in 9. 29 M.:

r. non multum abĕst hoc cacosyntheton atque canina (MS *a re non* &c.)
si lingua dico 'nihil ad me'

(i.e. the sound of *r* is like the growl of a lazy dog, like 'what care I?' in dogs' language), where Mueller's corrections of the MS. reading to *r nonnullum habet...utque...sic...ar me* are unnecessary. The *ore cŏrupto* of 9. 1, and the *natura corumptum* of Lucr. 6. 1135, hardly come under the Breves Breviantes law, but are rather to be compared to *ŏmitto* for *ommitto*, *rĕduco* for *redduco* etc. In the passage of Consentius (p. 400, 8 K.) where this scansion of Lucilius is mentioned, it is possible that an example of shortening by this law is quoted from a hexameter of Ennius: but the passage, as it stands in the MSS., is unfortunately corrupt. They read: sicut Lucilius 'ore corupto': dempsit enim unam litteram per metaplasmum r: et Ennius

huic statuam statui maiorum & obatu athenis;

et hic quoque per metaplasmum dempsit litteram r. This line of Ennius, possibly from his *Saturae*, may indeed have contained some scansion like *et ŏrbatur*, with neglect of the lengthening by position before *rb*, or as Consentius puts it, 'with omission of the letter *r*'. But a passage in Pompeius

(p. 283, 13 K.): dicitur barbarismus, quando dico 'mamor' pro eo quod est marmor...et ut puta si dicas 'relliquias' pro eo quod est reliquias, suggests that the 'omission of the letter *r*' referred to may have been in the fourth, not in the penultimate word of the line; for the 'barbarismus' mentioned by Pompeius may quite well have been not a mere mispronunciation of his time, but (like *relliquiae*) a scansion found in early poetry.

W. M. LINDSAY.

[1]THE PROSODY OF MICO THE LEVITE.

THE following is taken from Ludwig Traube's account of MICO in the 3rd volume of Dümmler's *Poetae Latini aeui Carolini*. At the time when it was written, Traube's work was only just in printing, but the kindness of the author allowed me to use the pages containing Mico before the volume was actually published. I had however, before receiving Traube's printed copy, made a collation (Aug. 1891) of the best MS. at Brussels.

Mico Leuita was a Levite or deacon of the Abbey of S. Riquier in Picardy, two miles from Abbeville[2]. He often calls himself *small* (*paruus, paruulus, pusillus*). *incipiant paruae glosae de diuersis libris excerptae a pusillitate Miconis.*

He lived from 825 to 853, and was a teacher of boys. He wrote a number of works both prose and verse; a book of *Epigrammata*, another of *Aenigmata;* perhaps *Epistolae;* and the prosodial work before us.

In his preface addressed to 'all lovers of wisdom' Mico states that the idea of drawing up such a work was suggested by a stranger who while sojourning with the monks of S. Riquier found fault with their reading particularly on the score of quantity. This led him to examine the Latin poets and, when he found words in which the length or shortness of a syllable was doubtful, to set side by side with each word an

[1] This lecture on Mico was read to the Oxford Philological Society in Feb. 1892, and some months later was delivered by me at the New Schools, Dec. 3 of the same year.

[2] The abbey had been founded by S. Richarius A.D. 630—638. It is ordinarily called Centula or vicus Centulus: Turribus a centum Centula nomen habet. The Benedictine Hariulphus wrote a Chronicle of the abbey in 4 books, which was continued to 1088 A.D.

instance, first the word, then the instance, lastly the name of the author or book. He adds that it was alphabetical, in order to facilitate reference: '*currit enim commode per alfabetum, ut facilius inueniatur, quod ab amante requiritur*,' where *amante* is the 'lover of wisdom,' i.e. the curious student.

Traube infers that this treatise of Mico was held in high estimation from the number of copies existing of it. There are two in the Royal Library at Brussels, the first and best of which (10,066—10,077) Traube makes the basis of his edition. This is the MS. I collated. The first page is to a great extent obliterated. The date, which Traube thought of cent. XII., I should have considered to be not later than X. or XI. This MS. is called by Traube *B*; the other Brussels MS., which is of inferior value, *b*. Besides these Traube had collations of

1. A Brit. Mus. MS Burney 357, cent. XII/XIII.
2. Erlangen, XV.
3. Halberstadt, XII.
4. Heidelberg.

There are, besides, an XIth cent. at Paris (1928), a Leyden MS. mentioned by Riese; one which was at Toul in the XIth century, and another at Louvain, cited by Heinsius, are also known to have been in existence: but Traube thinks that the Louvain codex which is described by Heinsius as 'admodum uetus' may be one of the two at Brussels.

Of the extent to which Mico's Prosody was read we may judge from the fact that a verse in it

Cattus in obscuris cepit pro sorice picam

which Mico ascribes to one *Sophocles*, is quoted exactly in the above form, not with either of the variants found elsewhere, Cattus in *obscuro* c. pro s. *pigam*, and is ascribed similarly to *Sophocles* in a Phillipps glossary of the XIIth cent.

The number of words, thus prosodially treated, is in the numeration of Traube 413. After the last word *Zizania* follows FINIT OPUS MICONIS, then 10 elegiac lines

Ipse Micon paucos studui decerpere sticos
Alfaque per betum figere marginibus,

Nomina doctorum simul e diuerso notare,
Vt foret accensis suffugium pueris.
Sed tamen hos lector uigili tu mente retracta
Vt teneas recta ac reprobes nocua.
At si profuerint, placeat iterare legendo,
Sin uero minime, sit tibi cura leuis.
Vnum te rogito: memor esse mei quoque semper
Digneris sanctis inque tuis precibus.

The two last seem borrowed from the conclusion of the [1]Commonitorium of Orientius, which however, as might be expected, is incomparably superior in metre, diction, and feeling.

Authors quoted in Mico.

These may be divided into three groups (1) classical, (2) Christian, (3) nondescript or of uncertain date.

(1) The poets cited of the classical period are as follows. Cicero's Aratea, Lucretius, the Copa, Moretum, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, the Aratea of Germanicus, Persius, Lucan, Statius, Martial, Iuvenal, the medical writer Serenus Sammonicus, the Fables of Avianus or as he is called in the Brussels MS. Avienus, the Periegesis of Priscian.

In prose Sallust, A. Gellius.

(2) The Christian poets cited are Paulinus of Nola, Paulinus of Perigueux, Prudentius, Arator, Prosper, Alcimus Avitus, Sedulius, Iuvencus, Apollinaris Sidonius, Orientius, Fortunatus, Martianus Capella, Beda, Alcuin, Paulus Diaconus.

(3) Under the nondescript class fall Catonis disticha; the *Carmen de Sodoma*, which Peiper in his edition of the Latin Metrical Heptateuch assigns to a Gallic Cyprianus; a *Rufinus V.C.*; a *Licentius* cited twice from a poem preserved by S.

[1] Orient. II. 407

At tu cum [re]legis nostrum quicumque libellum,
Nostri, seu malus est seu bonus, esto memor.

and

Nominis abscedat ne tibi cura mei,
Vt peccatores uincens Orientius omnes
Sanctorum ueniam promerear precibus.

Augustin in one of his Epistles; a *Favinius* whose poem on weights and measures is twice cited 58, 141: an author abridged as TEOD; a medieval poet known by the name of *Smaragdus*, the *carmen de diebus* Bährens PLM v. p. 352: the *praecepta uiuendi* Dümmler I. 278 (STATERA).

A name abridged as LI (90, 339) is wrongly appended to two vv. of Martial.

The verses are on the whole correctly ascribed to their authors: but there are a considerable number of exceptions. This is particularly true of the Christian poet *Alcimus*, or, as Mico writes him, ALCHIMVS. To Alcimus are assigned no less than 19 verses: of which only five are really by him.

I must here in passing not omit to criticize a point in my friend Mr Rudolf Peiper's edition, otherwise most excellent, of the Latin Metrical Heptateuch. Peiper, finding many of the verses quoted by Mico from Alcimus in this Heptateuch, concludes that others unknown *also* came from lost parts of the same work. Anyone who will take the trouble to examine the verses and the passages of Scripture to which Peiper supposes them to refer will see how very uncertain this is. Nay, Peiper has gone beyond this and actually ventured to refer to a lost part of the Heptateuch a verse very familiar to most readers of Latin Poetry, which Mico quotes s.v. INDICO and ascribes to Prosper. It is really one of nine verses sometimes, but wrongly, attributed to Martial, sometimes called PROLOGUS AVIANI, Prologue to the fables of Avianus: so in one of the Bodleian MSS. used by me for my edition.

The Heptateuch is quoted also by Mico under BISSINA and assigned to *Prosper*, under SATVRO and ascribed to *Ovid*, under FERITA, to Ovid; proof of the important position held by this book, almost unknown till the late Card. Pitra published the Cambridge MS., but now universally accessible in the edition of Peiper, and become interesting to all students of the later Latin prosody by the masterly criticism of J. E. B. Mayor.

The following collection of instances of verses ascribed by Mico to wrong authors is not exhaustive.

164[1] *Fenicis* nomen cui dedit ipsa uenus *Fortunatus*, really in Carmen de Phoenice 66.

171 Nec[2] *uagus* in laxa pes tibi pelle natet *Martialis*, really in Ov. A. A. I. 516.

173 Quanta *Gigantei* memoratur mensa triumphi *Iuvenal*, really in Mart. VIII. 50, 1.

206 Et sit in *infida* proditione fides, ascribed to F, really in A. A. III. 578.

209 *Irritatque* uirum telis atque ultro lacessit—*Prudentius*, really in Verg. Aen. X. 644 (with *et uoce* lacessit).

227 Ad *Lapithas* bello perdis Iacche graui—*Verg.* and *Ovid*, really in *Vitalis, de libidine et uino.*

234 *Myrrina* signauit seposuitque diem (*sic*)—to *Lī*, really in Martial. So 339 Quid te Cappadocum *saxonus* (sex onus) esse iuuat.

248 Sic edocta suo seruit *macedonia* Paulo—to *Arat*, really by Walafrid Strabo.

280 Balsama nec desunt quis rediit *Paphie*—to Ovid, really in Carm. de Mensibus PLM I. 207.

300 Somnia *pituita* qui purgatissima mittunt—to *Juvenal*, really in Persius II. 57.

322 Flentibus Heliadum ramis dum uipera *repit* to *Juvenal*, really in Martial IV. 59. 1.

334 Claudendus parui corpore *sarcofagi*, to *Prudentius*, really in ORIENTIVS I. 538, but with marmore for corpore.

344 *Septimanis* decies quinis simul atque duabus, to *Prudentius*, really in *C. de diebus* PLM V. 352.

347 Viscera iam *saturo* portabat capta parenti to *Ovid*, really in the HEPTATEVCH.

387 Seu lentum ceroma teris tepidumue *trigona*, to *Juvenal*, really in Martial IV. 19. 5.

399 *Vsque quo* (vos quoque) si media speculum spectetis in ira to Martial, really in A. A. III. 507.

[1] The verse-words italicized are those under which the verse will be found in Mico.

[2] s.v. GIROVAGVS.

The following is a list of the verses whose authorship is unknown to Traube.

41 ANATIS. Mox anatis profuge quo sibi praedo foret. PRVD̄. NOV̄.

120 DIRIVO. Contra particulam quae diriuata uidetur.

This v. is omitted in most MSS. of Mico. It is not ascribed to any author, but the v. preceding it (119) is assigned to SED (Sedulius), and perhaps Mico thought that this was sufficient indication of 120 also. He has done so in other cases.

286 PERFORAT. Perforat hasta uirumque et confinia dorsi (*et trans* conj. Traube).

Not assigned to any author, previous v. to OVID̄.

310 PERSIDEM. Symon persidem dulci comitatus iuda [no author assigned: 309 to IVVENAL].

360 SVBREPAT. Nec tibi fallacis subrepat imago decoris PAVLINVS.

367 SATAGO. Intulerat satagens propriis licet illa cibando PAVLINVS.

370 SAT ERIT. Iam sat erit nobis uano sermone narrare SEDVL̄.

The most interesting of the citations in Mico are no doubt those from Lucretius. These amount to 13 lines in all. I will cite them in the order of the books in which they respectively occur.

Lucret. I. 275 Saluifragis uexat flabris ita *perfurit* acri.

Siluifragis *AB*.

396 Nec si iam posset sine inani posset *opinor*.

II. 128 Significant *clandestinos* caecosque subesse.

365 *Diriuare* queunt animum curamque leuare.

curamque *A*. curaque *B* and edd.

388 Praeterea lumen per cornum *transitat* imber.

cornum *AB*: transit at *seemingly AB*: Mico thought it came from TRANSITO, which word is written *sic* at the beginning of the excerpt.

447 In quo iam genere primis *adamantina* saxa.

in primis *AB*.

663 (2) Buceriaeque greges *eodem* sub tegmine caeli.

966 Inque locum quando *remigrant* sit blanda uoluptas.

fit *AB*.

IV. 1232 Siue uirum soboles siue est *mulieris* origo.

suboles *AB*. muliebris *AB*. Mico thought that the *e* of *mulieris* was long, as the word illustrated is *mulieres*.

V. 6 Nemo ut *opinor* erit mortali corpore cretus.

598 Largifluum fontem *scatere* atque erumpere lumen.

lumen *also AB*, not *flumen*.

1221 Contremit et magnum percurrunt murmure caelum.

murmura *edd.* murmure *AB*, as Mico. Munro does not notice this.

VI. 752 Cornices non cum fumant altaria donis.

There are no quotations from B. III.: probably a mere accident.

No v. of Catullus Tibullus or Propertius is cited, nor from Manilius. On the other hand the Aratea both of Cicero and Germanicus furnish, the former four, the latter two verses. The vv. from Cicero's Aratea are

hic liquescit s.

92 *Delphinus* iacet haud nimio lustratus nitore:

The elided *s* is described as *melting away*.

5 Andromede signum *Deltoton* dicere grai.

145 *Namque etiam* Heridanum cernes in parte locatum.

Mico adds *h* to *Eridanus*: Bährens' MSS. of Cicero's Aratea seem to give *Eridanum*.

317 *Zodiacum* hunc greci uocitant nostrique latini.

The two vv. of the Aratea of Germanicus are

332 Sic uagina ensis *pernicis* sic pede lucet.

This is assigned to *Cesar in Arāt.* (303 Traube). Bährens' best MSS. give *pernici*, which is right, not *pernicis*.

239 Hunc aries iuxta medium *deltoton* habebit.

Other MSS. give *Huc* or *Huic*. But *Hunc* is the reading of

the Basel MS. (B) and (P) Paris 7886. As B is of saec. IX. and *omnium codicum facile princeps* P of IX. or X., it is clear that Mico used a good codex.

I regard this as a very signal proof how little the interesting poem of MANILIVS was read in the Early Middle Age. As regards popularity it was quite eclipsed by the tame Aratea of Cicero, and the spirited version of Germanicus Caesar.

The loss of the poet's name may have had something to do with this.

Passing to Ovid, I find not a few citations from his works.

A. A. *eight* citations (12, 130, 171, 206, 351, 365, 368, 399.)
Amor. *three* „ (77, 151, 261.)
Heroid. *one* „ (215.)
Remed. *one* „ (366.)
Fasti *four* „ (117, 285, 350, 361.)
Metamm. *six* „ (24, 98, 101, 133, 152, 186.)
Tristia *four* „ (15, 89, 166, 288.)
Pont. *one* „ (329.)

Ibis, one possible reference in the word THEODOTVS (394), noted by Traube.

None from the Halieut., de Medic. Faciei, Epic. Drusi, Nux.

These statistics have their interest. Mico makes *eight* quotations from the A. A., only *six* from the Metamm., only *three* from the Amores. Am I wrong in again believing that the fact of the *Amores* being habitually without title in the MS. tradition of the middle ages, caused it to be less read? It may have been thought doubtfully Ovid's. Every one knows that in lists of Ovid's works preserved in the Middle Age, this, the finest of his poems, is always called *Ouidius sine titulo.* This may help to show why the work of Manilius, which was equally *sine titulo,* was less asked for and less read. It was not that Astronomy and Astrology were uninteresting, but that the author of the best poem on the subject was an unknown personage.

As regards the v. of the Ibis, which oddly enough is one of the most debatable lines of the poem, 465, 6 *Victima uel*

Phoebo sacras macteris ad aras, Quam tulit a saeuo Theudotus hoste necem, if this passage is really meant by Mico, as the singular juxtaposition of the two words *Theodotus, Ouidius* makes probable, the MS. which Mico read circ. 850 A.D. must have been much earlier than any we possess, which do not go back beyond the latter half of cent. XII. It is interesting therefore to find Theodotus with *o*, not The*u*dotus with *u*, at a date so comparatively early, *i.e.* scarcely after 800 A.D. All the MSS. which I collated for my edition of the *Ibis* have also Theodotus; Theudocus is found in Conrad de Mure: but the point I would insist upon is the faithfulness with which our XI. and XII. century MSS. reproduce originals of 200 or 300 years before.

AVIANVS and ORIENTIVS.

The fables of Avianus are cited 3 times, V. 5, XXIX. 15, XXXIV. 15.

V. 5 Exuuias asinus getuli forte leonis. AVIENVS.

XXIX. 15 Optulit et calido plenum cratera lico. AVIENVS.

XXIV. 15 Paruula tunc ridens sic est affata cicada. AVIENVS.

Most MSS. give *cicadam*, rightly: my Brit. Mus. *B* agrees with Mico in *cicada*.

In each case the poet is called Avienus, not Avianus. In my Prolegomena to the Fables I suggested that the author was really the Avienus who is one of the interlocutors in Macrobius' *Saturnalia*: and this view is certainly confirmed by Mico.

From the *Commonitorium* of the Christian poet ORIENTIVS are quoted 3 verses.

I. 538 Claudendus parui corpore sarcofagi. PRVD.

Marmore both MSS. of Orientius.

II. 34 Austero properes plectere iudicio. ORATIVS.

properes Mico, and so Commire, the Jesuit, emended the MS. reading *proceres*.

I. 347 Praetereo clades *Spartanas* et troica bell(a) (no author assigned).

Praetereo Mico and *A*, Praeterea *B*: *et troica* Mico and *A*, et *om. B.* The agreement of Mico with *A* in the unmetrical reading *et troica* is noticeable.

The right name of the poet is not preserved in any of the three: the ORATIVS however of the 2nd passage is a natural corruption of ORENTIVS.

SERENVS SAMMONICVS.

It is strange to find the medical poem of Serenus S. quoted in a IXth century treatise no less than 10 times. According to Teuffel it was written by the younger Serenus, son of an older physician, in the first half of the 3rd cent. A.D. Lampridius, one of the writers of the Augustan History, states that it was one of the favorite books of the Emperor Alexander Severus in common with Cic. de Officiis, de Republica, and Horace. This may have given it a popularity which kept it alive. It is in 1107 hexameters. Some verses prefixed to it in the Zurich MS. of cent. IX. inform us that the poem was copied by order of Charlemagne, whose death year is 814, only a short time before Mico's era.

The following variants from the MSS. of Serenus are observable in Mico's citations.

Ser. Sammon. 1101 Quod fuerit uero conchili sanguine *tritum*, tinctum MSS.

617 *Diptamnum* bibitur cocleae manduntur edules.

Diptamnum Bährens' inferior codd.: *Dictamnum* A.

1088 Aut facilis lapati *comulatior* ulcera purgat.

Bährens' MSS. give *cumulatior: coma latior* is the right reading.

Mico seems nearer the truth therefore than most MSS.

989 Nec non mandragorae *gustus sapor* additur altus.

gustu sopor MSS. Ser. is speaking of insomnia.

383 Vulturis atque iecur uel ius perdicis apertae.

Vulturisue B, -isque A: *apricae* MSS., but the best, A, adds *uel discis* (i.e. discissae).

Here the reading is not so easy to determine.

It is not to be forgotten that there are quotations from Serenus S. in the earlier collections of prosodial instances contained in the Vatican and Paris MSS. collated by Keil and Chatelain, which Traube believes to have been the basis of Mico and to have been drawn up in Lombardy.

The Pseudo-Vergilian poems are represented twice: the Moretum s.v. *dilatat,* and the Copa s.v. *fiscinas.*

Moret. 48 Lacuat opus palmisque suum *dilatat* in orbem.

Copa 17 Sunt et caseoli *quos iuncea fiscina* siccat

in which Mico agrees with the Bembinus, against the reading of some MSS. *q. sirpea f. siccat.* Vergil, of course, recurs repeatedly, far oftener than Horace: not less frequently Juvenal and Martial, which two authors together supply the largest number of verses. Lucan and Horace are both pretty frequent: Statius very occasional, and never the *Silvae.*

Persius as a name occurs several times, as it does also in the earlier *Exempla* collated by Chatelain. In these latter it is often written by mistake for Priscianus, whose *Periegesis* recurs in them again and again. Even in Mico Priscianus is tolerably frequent: but Mico obviously possessed a far larger stock of material to draw from. In him too the name Persius occurs sometimes where the line does not come from any of Persius' satires.

It is curious to find embedded in these poetic fragments scraps from prose writers.

From[1] Sallust is quoted s.v. ENIMVERO *Verum enimuero is demum mihi uiuere ac frui* (Catil. II. fin.), quoted from the grammar of Priscian. How familiar Mico was with Priscian is shown by the quotation from him s.v. ILIACAS. *oportet scire quidem analogiae rationem, usum tamen auctorum magis aemulari, i.e. sequi, sicut docet Priscianus.*

From Claudius Quadrigarius ap. Prisc. I. 484 Hertz is

[1] Hinc *repetita* sacri gradiens per moenia templi SALL is unknown.

quoted s.v. INTERITIS *Pugna acriter commissa multis utrumque interitis.*

Of Christian poets Prudentius is the most largely quoted. This is indicated by his name being frequently abridged to P̄, with which PRVD̄ alternates. In many cases lines ascribed by Mico to other poets come from Prudentius. After Prudentius, Paulinus and Alcimus are the names most frequently appended to Christian verses, but each is often a wrong ascription. In all cases where Paulinus is rightly added, Paulinus of Nola is meant: twice only Paulinus of Perigueux (Mic. 383 and 111). After these Fortunatus, sometimes as F̄, then Sedulius and Prosper. The *Genesis* of Hilarius appears in Mic. 207. Arator, Sidonius, Iuvencus, Orientius, Eugenius of Toledo are only occasional. The hexameter poem of young Licentius, son of a friend of S. Augustin, and included in one of Augustin's Epistles (XXVI), is quoted s.v. BORINI:

Lic. 57 Nec fera tempestas zefirum fremitusque *borini.*

s.v. ROMOLIDVM:

71 Et nunc *Romolidum* sedes et inania tecti.

Bahrens' MSS. of Augustin *remi* or *reti.*

Bede, Paul the Deacon, Alcuin (341), each occur once. The poem on Sodom is ascribed wrongly to Alcimus Avitus; it is quoted once s.v. IBIDEM[1].

Carmen Phoenicis is cited Mic. 164 and ascribed to Fortunatus.

To these must be added the following medieval writers.

1. Smaragdus Abbot of S. Michael on the Meuse †826—830. A man of importance in the court of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. He put into verse the Ars Donati de VIII. partibus orationis (Dümml. I. 605 sqq.). It is cited by Mico s.v. DECADAS:

126 Per decadas centum. per centum mille redundant.

2. Theodulfus 760—821, seemingly a Spanish Goth, was received by Charlemagne and made bishop of Orleans. High in favour with C., and his successor.

[1] Restituunt tectis demens at uulgus ibidem (*carm. de Sodom.* 72).

His poem *Bibliotheca* twice cited by Mico.

79 Penituisse placet solatur tertia eosdem.

129 Erudit externos propriis sic actibus actus.

3. Paul the Deacon, 720 to about 800, cited by Mic. 224.

Cur proconde times stillam prebere [1]lechito?

4. Walafrid Strabo 808, 9—849. Abbot of Reichenau.

Mic. 248 Sic edocta suo seruit Macedonia Paulo.

[I have not added anything to this article, from want of health. But the work of Mico, as a whole, now accessible to all scholars in Traube's erudite edition (vol. 3 of Dümmler's *Poetae Latini aeui Carolini*), I commend to the notice of all Latin scholars, only adding, what some may not know, that among the rising generation of students of the Middle Age, no one holds a more prominent position than Traube.]

ROBINSON ELLIS.

[1] =lecytho=uasi olei ad luminanda (Du Cange).

EURIPIDES.

TWO SUGGESTIONS ON THE IPHIGENIA IN AULIS.

370 sqq. Ἑλλάδος μάλιστ' ἔγωγε τῆς ταλαιπώρου στένω,
ἥ θέλουσα δρᾶν τι κεδνόν, βαρβάρους τοὺς οὐδένας
καταγελῶντας ἐξανήσει διά σε καὶ τὴν σὴν κόρην.
373 μηδὲν ἂν χείους ἔκατι προστάτην θείμην χθονός,
μηδ' ὅπλων ἄρχοντα· νοῦν χρὴ τὸν στρατηλάτην ἔχειν.

'μηδὲν ἂν χείους corr. by an early hand to μηδέν' ἂν χρέους P, μηδέν' ἂν χρέους (the ε in an erasure) L.' E. B. England, in his new edition of this play.

England adopts in 373 the conj. of Reiske, γένους for χείους or χρέους of PL, and οὖν from Monk for ἄν. The latter must, I think, be right; but it is hardly probable that γένους could have been corrupted into χείους or χρέους. Among the conjectures which I have seen I do not find χάους; yet it seems a very possible explanation of χείους. The adjective χάϊος is found as a trisyllable in Ar. Lysist. 90 χαΐα ναὶ τὼ σιώ, Κορινθία δ' αὖ. ΛΥ. χαΐα νὴ τὸν Δία Δήλη 'στιν οὖσα ταυταγὶ τἀντευθενί: 1157 οὔπω γυναῖκ' ὄπωπα χαϊωτέραν. In both places the schol. explain it as = 'good'. The MSS. of Theocritus, VII. 4—6, δύο τέκνα Λυκωπέος, εἴ τί περ ἐσθλὸν, Χαῶν τῶν ἐπάνωθεν, ἀπὸ Κλυτίας τε καὶ αὐτῶ Χάλκωνος, give χαῶν, though Briggs proposed and Meineke (after Ahrens de dial. dor. p. 76) accepted παῶν. The scholia however interpreted χαῶν, explaining εἴτι ἀγαθὸν ὄντες ἀπὸ ἀγαθῶν ἤτοι εὐγενῶν, and again εὐγενῶν πλουσίων παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις. And so Hesych. χαιά (so the codex) ἀγαθή, and χαιός ἀγαθός. The same word is found as a compound in the Aeschylean βαθυχαΐος, Suppl.

858, where the schol. explains *ἡ μεγάλως εὐγενής· χάοι* (? *χαοι*) *γὰρ οἱ εὐγενεῖς.*

This Doric adj. *χάϊος* seems specially connected with good birth; lineage, we may suppose, descending from high antiquity. It must have been formed from a noun *χάος*.

We may conjecture either that the *original* sense of that word connoted the idea of primal or primeval, possibly the hollow of earth regarded as the source of *autochthonous* inhabitants; or at least that Chaos was regarded as the ultimate or primal source of things, *πρώτιστα χάος γένετ'* Hes. Theog. 116, and that hence *chaic* was applied to something immemorially antique, or possessing the first freshness of time. In this reference cf. Verg. G. IV. 347, *Aque Chao densos divum numerabat amores*, Ov. Ib. 83, 4, *Denique ab antiquo dini veteresque novique In nostrum cuncti tempus adeste chao.* As here Chaos is called *antiquum*, so *χάος ἀρχαῖον* in the hymn to Artemis in the papyrus magica, edited by Dietrich, p. 775, and in the Orphic Argonautica 12 and 423 (cited by Dietrich).

865 *ὁ λόγος εἰς μέλλοντ' ἂν ὤση χρόνον, ἔχει δ' ὄγκον τινά.*

The corrupt *ἂν ὤση* of both P and L is perhaps to be corrected into *ἀνωσθῇ*. 'Let your story be put off till a future time: it is tiresome' or 'troublesome'. Soph. O. C. 1162 *βραχύν τιν' αἰτεῖ μῦθον οὐκ ὄγκου πλέων.* 1341 *βραχεῖ ξὺν ὄγκῳ καὶ χρόνῳ.*

ROBINSON ELLIS.

A SUGGESTION ON PROP. II. 34. 29, 30.

Aut quid crethei } tibi prosunt carmina lecta?
erechti }
Nil iuuat in magno uester amore senex.

crethei *Bährens' DFV* erechti *N*.

The person whom Propertius addresses in this elegy is a friend whom he calls *Lynceus*. Consequently *uester* would seem to point to some poet specially connected with the *family* of Lynceus. Is such a poet discoverable?

There was a literary man of the name of Lynceus in the period of Theophrastus and Menander. He was the pupil of Theophrastus, and wrote on Menander. Athenaeus quotes him several times as Lynceus of Samos, and states that he was a brother of the historian Duris. His date would thus be the end of the 4th and beginning of the 3rd century B.C.

This Lynceus was much in the intimacy of the poets of his time, and was himself the author of a comedy called *the Centaur*, of which Athenaeus cites a considerable fragment, 131 f. Besides his work on Menander, of which Athenaeus quotes the second book (ἐν δευτέρῳ περὶ Μενάνδρου, 242 b), he wrote an Epistle to the comic writer Poseidippus (ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν κωμικὸν Ποσειδιππον ἐπιστολῇ, 652 d).

The scholia on Theocr. IV. 31 κῆν μὲν τὰ Γλαύκας ἀγκρούομαι, εὖ δὲ τὰ Πύρρω, say ὁ δὲ Πύρρος Ἐρυθραῖος ἢ Λέσβιος, μελῶν ποιητής: again, οὗτος ὁ Πύρρος ποιητὴς ἦν Ἐρυθραῖος, ὥς φησι Λυγκεύς, to which some MSS. add ἐγένετο δὲ κατόπιν Φιλοξένου τοῦ διθυραμβοποιοῦ. From these it appears that Lynceus (no doubt the same, as nothing is added to differentiate

him,) had written on the poet Pyrrhus, mentioned by Theocritus, and that this poet was from *Erythrae*.

Pyrrhus of Erythrae is identified by Meineke, Anal. Alexandrin. p. 245, with Pyres the Milesian, whom Athenaeus, 620 e, mentions with Alexander Aetolus and others as a writer of Ἰωνικὰ ἄσματα: for Suidas s. v. Σωτάδης in a passage speaking of the same ἰωνικοὶ λόγοι similarly combines (not Pyres, but) Pyrrhus with Alexander Aetolus, and calls him *Pyrrhus the Milesian*.

This Pyrrhus I contend to have been the poet alluded to by Propertius. He was a friend of the Samian Lynceus, who had written about him, and had called him an *Erythraeum*. Propertius' friend Lynceus was descended from the Samian Lynceus, and kept up the literary traditions of his family by reading and quoting the poems of this Erythraean Pyrrhus. He had, it would seem, introduced him to the notice of Propertius as a poet whom his ancestor Lynceus had written about; hence Propertius calls him *Erythraeus* and *uester senex*, the veteran poet patronized by Lynceus and his ancestor the Samian before him. For *crethei* or *erechti* then I propose to write *Erythraei*.

It would follow that Pyrrhus, probably in a lyrical poem of some kind, had written on amatory subjects; and, from Propertius' words *nil iuuat in magno amore*, in a light vein little calculated to soothe the pangs of Propertius' friend.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

BENTLEY'S NOTES ON THE ODYSSEY.

THESE notes as is well known are written in Bentley's copy of Stephanus' *Poetae Graeci*, 1566. They consist of restorations of the digamma and other conjectures, references to Eustathius, Hesychius etc., with many corrections of Hesychius, and readings from five MSS. His account of the last is as follows: "Collatus cum codice Collegii Benedicti Cantab. C vel sine litera.

L codex Harley Londini.
L_2 codex alter Harley.
L_3 codex tertius Harley.
M codex 4^{tus} Harley cum *σχολ.*"

"C vel sine litera" means that his quotations from this MS are marked with C or that any quotations with no letter attached are to be understood to be from C. Sometimes a reading is given with no letter attached at first and L or M or whatever it may be written over it afterwards; thus at *α* 360 we have "*οἰκόνδ' ἐβε*" with "L" added later; this means "*οἰκόνδ' ἐβεβήκει* CL." I mention this as I could not understand his system at first myself, and the hint may possibly be useful to others. He also refers to "H" frequently; what this means I do not know, but it is *not* all the Harleian MSS together as one would naturally suppose.

It does not appear worth while to print all these readings, and I have therefore generally omitted them, as also trifling corrections of the text of Stephanus taken from them where Stephanus is palpably wrong. Such things throw no light on Bentley's own work.

The quotations from Eustathius etc. are worth printing on

the other hand, more particularly as containing corrections of other authors besides Homer for which other scholars have at present sole credit. Moreover many of his quotations from other authors in support of a reading are not to be found in La Roche's *Testimonia Veterum* or Ludwich's *Apparatus Criticus*.

For the first book, but for the first alone, I have given all the insertions of the digamma; afterwards only any that strike me as for any reason interesting. Everything quoted from Bentley is put in inverted commas. The accents are so remarkable that I thought it best to spare the feelings of a more accurate and precise generation and have generally corrected them.

As a rule the longer notes are written by Bentley at the top of the page, though sometimes also at the bottom, short corrections in the margin, the readings of the MSS at the bottom. I am induced by several reasons to reduce my own observations on them to a minimum.

ARTHUR PLATT.

a.

3. "Heliodorus p. 47 Πολλῶν τε ἀνθρώπων ἤθη τε καὶ νοῦς εἰς πεῖραν ἥκουσιν". Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

3. "ϝίδε ϝάστεα"

4. "ϝὸν"

4. "σχο. ἄλγεα. ἐνταῦθα στικτέον. Aristoph. σχολ. p. 74 ad Nubes; κρόταλον, παιπάλη, ὅθεν τὸν στίχον τῆς Ὀδυσσείας οὕτως ἀξιοῦσι γράφειν τινές, Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα πολύκροτον"

5. "ϝήν"

6. ἰέμενος. "ϝιέ"

7. "Hes. σφετέρῃσι"

10. Bracketed. "Hesyc. ἀμόθεν etc." and in margin "ἔννεπε χ' Il. B. 238" but this is crossed out again. "ἀμόθεν nusquam alibi".

12. οἶκοι. "ϝοι"

16. ἔπος. "ϝέ"

17. "ϝοι ϝοί" i.e. ϝοι and ϝοἰκόνδε

18. "ἄεθλον" for ἀέθλων. "vide Od. ι, 455" (πεφυγμένον εἶναι ὄλεθρον)

19. οἶσι. "ϝοῖ"

21. "ϝὴν"

23. Αἰθίοπας. "πες 51". 51 is quoted for change to nominative: νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ...νῆσος δενδρήεσσα. At foot of page: "23 Αἰθίοπας τοι. Legendum Αἰθίοπες: si vera lectio Il. Z, 396 Ἠετίων"

24. "Aristarchus οἱ μὲν—οἱ δ' Crates vero Ἡ μὲν,—ἢ δ' Strabo pag. 30. sed 103 Ἡ μὲν ἀπερχομένου vel οἱ μὲν ἀπερχ."

29. "νοῦν ἀνοήμονος" for θυμὸν ἀμύμονος Αἰγίσθοιο.

31. ἔπεα. "ϝε"

34. "Eust. οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι τῶν παλαιῶν, Ὑπέρμορον" (for ὑπὲρ μόρον).

37. "ϝε" i.e. ϝειδώς. "προεϝει" i.e. προεϝείπομεν, for πρό οἱ εἴπομεν.

41. "καὶ ἐῆς" for τε καὶ ἧς.

46. "ϝε" i.e. ϝεοικότι.

51. "pro δώματα, leg. πότνια" the last two words crossed out again. "Vide ἐνναίουσι, ἐνναίει" (?) For πότνια he also refers to η 246, where Calypso is called ἐϋπλόκαμος δεινὴ θεός. His objection here is to the construction of ἐνναίειν, but is somewhat frivolous, as the order of the words is θεὰ δὲ ναίει δώματα ἐν (αὐτῇ). However he returns to the charge in a later note: "Eust. Not. ἐν δώματα ναίει sed lego θεὰ δ' ἐν πότνια ναίει. Ἐνναίει absolute ut ἐνναίουσι Il. I, 154, 296. Sic Od. ε. 215. eam compellans πότνα θεά. non δώματα ἔναιεν, sed σπέος Ibidem". This last reason is clearly an afterthought.

52. "οϝοφ" i.e. ὀλοϝόφρονος.

53. οἶδεν. "ϝοῖ"

58. ἱέμενος. "ϝιέ"

59. "ϝῆς"

60. "leg. ὀλύμπι'. ἢ οὔ νύ τ' B. 60 et 312". B = *Od.* ii. He also refers to α 298; all three are to illustrate a question introduced by ἢ οὐ.

61. "ϝι" i.e. ϝιερὰ, but crossed out again.

62. "*ϝοι*"

64. *ἔπος.* "*ϝέ*"

67. Bracketed.

70. "fo 'Αντίθεος Πολύφημος. et an *ἦε μέγ*" (*ἦε μέγιστον*, but *ἦε* is nowhere found for *ἦεν*).

71. "leg. *πᾶσ' ἐν* Κυ" (*κλώπεσσιν*). Stephanus has *πᾶσι* Κυκλώπεσσιν; in *margin* Bentley corrects to *πᾶσιν*.

78. "*ϝὸν*"

79. "*αϝε*" i.e. *ἀϝέκητι*.

83. *νοστῆσαι.* "*-ήσειν*". *ὅνδε.* "*ϝόν*"

85. *ὀτρύνομεν.* "*-νεμεν*"

86. *εἴπῃ.* "*ϝει*"

88. "*ϝοι*"

89. "*ϝοι*"

91. *μνηστήρεσσιν ἀπειπέμεν.* "*-σσ' ἀποϝει.*" Also "*ϝοι*"

92. *ἕλικας.* "*ϝε*"

93. "Eust. *τινὲς γράφουσιν, ἐς Κρήτην τε* et ad *γ* Od. p. 130 *Ζηνοδότῳ* ascribit"

105. *εἰδομένη.* "*ϝει*"

110. *ἄρ' οἶνον.* "*ϝοῖνον*", *ἄρ'* being omitted.

112. *προτίθεντο, ἰδὲ.* "*-τ', ἠδὲ*"

113. *ἴδε.* "*ϝί*". *θεοειδής.* "*οϝει*"

117. *οἷσιν ἀνάσσοι.* "*ϝοῖσι ϝα*"

118. *εἴσιδ'.* "*ἐσϝ*"

122. *ἔπεα.* "*ϝέ*"

125. *εἰπών.* "*ϝει*"

134. *ἀδήσειεν.* "*ϝα*"

135. *ἀποιχομένοιο ἔροιτο.* "*ϝέ*" i.e. *ϝέροιτο*, crossed out again, and then "*-ου ἐρέοιτο*".

138. "Hes. *ξεστήν—παρὰ δὲ ξ.ε.τ.*" i.e. Hesychius quotes *παρὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.* s.v. *ξεστήν*.

141. Bracketed. "*Ἀθετεῖ* Athenaeus lib. 5. Vide hic *η*, 176. Vide Eust. Od. p. 35". Athen. v. 20 p. 193, Eust. 1401, 21. (La Roche.)

143. *οἰνοχοεύων.* "*ϝοι*"

154. "Herod. vita Hom. *Φημίῳ ὃς δὴ πολλὸν ἐκαίνυτο πάντας ἀείδων*"

158. *κεν εἴπω.* "*κε ϝει* 389"

159. "Hesyc. *ἀναβάλλετ'* et *'Ανεβ.*"

163. *ἰδοίατο.* "*ϝιδ*"

165. *ἐσθῆτος.* "*ϝε*"

167. *θαλπωρὴ.* "*ϝελ*" and "Eustath. Not. *γράφεται καὶ ἐλπωρή*"

169. *εἰπὲ.* "*ϝεῖ*"

174. *εἰδῶ.* "*ϝει*"

175. *μεθέπεις.* "*μ' ἐφέπεις*"

176. *ἴσαν.* "*ϝί*", crossed out again.

178. *προσέειπε.* "*ϝει*"

181. *φιληρέτμοισιν ἀνάσσω.* "*σι ϝα*"

183. *οἴνοπα.* "*ϝοί*" *ἐπ'.* "*ἐς*" for which he quotes "M '*ἐς*' *ἄλλο*", and which apparently he prefers.

184. "Strabo 285 *τεμέσην*, alij *Ταμασον.* Et Steph. Byz. *Ταμάσεος—τινὲς γράφουσιν ἐς Ταμέσην μετὰ χ. ἀπιθάνως.* nam Tamese Italiae urbs. Idem in *Τεμέση*"

186. *ὑπὸ Νηΐῳ.* "Eust. *τινὲς ὑφ' ἕν*" and "Eust. Not. *τινὲς, ὑπὸ νηρίτῳ ὑλ.* Licet *νήριτον εἰνοσίφυλλον*"

190. *πάσχει* (sic Steph.). After correcting to "*σχειν*" Bentley suggests "*πέσσειν*".

191. "*ϝοι*"

192. *λάβῃσι.* "*σιν*", next line beginning with a vowel.

193. *οἰνοπέδοιο.* "*ϝοι*"

199. *ἀέκοντα.* "*ἀϝε*"

202. *εἰδώς.* "*ϝει*"

203. *οὔ τι ἔτι.* "*τοι*" for *τι* from his MSS.

206. *εἰπὲ.* "*ϝει*"

208. *ἔοικας.* "*ϝε*" i.e. *ϝέοικας.*

210. "Hesyc. *ἀναβήμεναι* post *ἀναγαγγ*"-*ανεύουσιν.*

212. *'Οδυσῆα ἐγὼν.* "*σῆ' ἄρ*" i.e. *'Οδυσῆ' ἄρ' ἐγών* or *ἐγώ.* *ἴδον.* "*ϝί*"

216. *οὐκ οἶδ'.* "*οὐ ϝοῖδ'*"

220. "Eust. Te No" (i.e. in text and notes). *γρ. σύ γε* Steph. marg.

221. *προσέειπε.* "*ϝει*"

224. *εἰπὲ.* "*ϝει*"

225. *τὶς δὲ ὅμιλος.* Bentley suggests *τὶς δέ* "*γ'*" or "*θ'*" in margin; at top of page: "fo. *τίς δὴ*, vel *τίς δ' ὅμιλος. τίς*

δέ γ'. *τίς δ' ἄρ' ὅμ.* sed Athen. lib. 9 ut edit." Athenaeus VIII, 362 (La Roche). Bentley appears to have thought that the first syllable of *ὅμιλος* might possibly be lengthened.

232. *οἶκος.* "*ϝοῖ*"

234. *ἐβάλοντο.* "Hes. *Ἐβόλοντο* etc." which reading he adopts in margin. "Eust. Tex Not *ἐβάλοντο*"

235. *ἄιστον.* "*αϝι*"

237. *οἷς.* "*ϝοῖς*"

239. *οἱ.* "*ϝοι*"

240. *ᾧ.* "*ϝῷ*"

242. *ἄιστος.* "*ἄϝι*"

248. *οἶκον.* "*ϝοῖ*"

251. *οἶκον.* "*ϝοῖ*"

258. *οἴκῳ.* "*ϝοι*"

261. "*ϝοι*"

262. "*ϝοι*"

263. *νεμεσίζετο.* "*ται γ.* 435". In both passages he corrects to avoid hiatus; *γ* 435, *εἰργάζετο. ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη.*

264. "*ϝοι*"

269. *οἷσιν.* "*ϝοι*"

270. *κεν μνηστῆρας.* Bentley crosses out *ν* of *κεν*, on authority of C.

275, 276. *μητέρα δ'...ἆψ ἴτω.* "vel *Μήτηρ ἴτω*, vel *Μητέρα ἴμεν.* Aristoph. *σχολ.* Nub. p. 114 *Μητέρα δ' εἴ τοι θυμὸς ἐποτρύνει γαμέεσθαι. ἀντὶ τοῦ μήτηρ*". "*Μητέρα.* Didym. olim *μητὲρ* pro *μητὴρ* ante Simon. inde error". In the margin Bentley puts "*ἴμεν*" for *ἴτω*. Also "*ϝοι*" for *οἱ.* Schol. Nubes 1115.

278. *ἔοικε.* "*ϝέ*"

282. *εἴπῃσι.* "*ϝεί*" *ὄσσαν.* "*ϝο*" crossed out again.

285. "Eustath. ut v. 93 *ā* legere ait *Ζηνόδοτον Πέμψω δ' ἐς Κρήτην τε*; sic hic ad *γ* Od. v. 130 Zenodotus, ait, *γράφει, Κεῖθεν δὲ Κρήτην δε παρ' Ἰδομεινῆα ϝάνακτα*". For v. 130 read p. 130.

291. "*ϝοι*"

292. *ἔοικε.* "*ϝοι*" *ϝέοικε*? He must have meant to write *ϝέ.*

293. *τε καὶ ἔρξῃς.* Bentley first writes in margin "dele *ϝε*" (i.e. read *καὶ ϝέρξῃς*, deleto *τε*), then crosses this out and writes

over it "δὲ ϝε", apparently for ἰδὲ ϝέρξῃς, as at top of page he has: "fo. τ' ἰδὲ ϝέρξῃς".

295. κεν μνηστῆρας, as on 270.

296. οὐδέ τι. "δ' ἔτι"

298. "Proclus in Polit. Plat. p. 364. Οὐχ ὁράας οἷον, etc." Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

300. ὅς οἱ. "ὅ ϝοι"

302. εἴπῃ. "ϝει"

308. "ϝῷ"

317. οἰκόνδε. "ϝοι"

319. εἰποῦσ'. "ϝει"

320. δ' ὥς. "δϝὼς"

321. "ϝε"

322. φρεσὶν ᾗσι. "σι ϝῇ"

323. ὀΐσατο. "σσ" from one of his MSS (ὀΐσσατο).

324. ἰσόθεος. "ϝι"

330. "ϝοῖο"

335. οἱ. "ϝοι" ἑκάτερθε. "ϝε"

337. οἶδας. "ϝοῖ"

338. ἔργ'. "ϝε"

340. οἶνον. "ϝοι"

346. ἄρ' αὖ φθονέεις corrected to ἄρα φθονέεις from MSS.

347. "ϝοι"

349. ἐθέλῃσιν ἑκάστῳ. "σι ϝε"

351. "Plato de Repub. 4. τὴν γὰρ α. μ. ἐπιφρονέουσ' ἄν. Ἥτις ἀκούοντεσσι σχολ Pind. Olym. 9 ut editio" (τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι).

356—9. Bracketed. "Il. ζ. 490. Od. φ. 350" where the lines occur again.

356. οἶκον and ἔργα are both marked but no note.

358. ἔργον. "ϝε"

359. οἴκῳ. "ϝοι"

360. οἰκόνδε. "ϝοι"

363. "ϝοι"

364. ἡδὺν. "ϝη"

371. ἐναλίγκιος. "ου" to agree with ἀοιδοῦ.

373. ἀποείπω. "οϝει"

375. οἴκους. "ϝοι"

379. *ἔργα.* "*ϝε*" "Hesyc. Δῷσι cum *ῑ*. Hes. *παλίντιτα*"

380. *νήποινοι* "*νες*" (*νήποινες*).

382. "Hes. *ὃ θαρσαλέως*, etc."

389. *εἴπερ μοι.* "158 *εἰ καί*" and "Eust. Not. *εἰ καί μοι*"

392. "*ϝοι*"

397. *οἴκοιο ἄναξ.* "*ϝοί ϝά*"

398. *λησάτο* "*σσ*" from MSS.

402. *δώμασιν οἷσιν ἀνάσσοις.* "*σι ϝοῖ σι σοῖσι*" alternative corrections for *δώμασιν οἷσιν.* "*σι ϝα*"-*νάσσοις.*

403. *ὅστις ἀέκοντα.* "*σ*'" is supplied from MSS after *ὅστις.* "*αϝεκ*"

404. *ἀποῤῥαίσει.* "fo *ἀποῤῥαίσει*'"

405. *ξείνοιο ἔρεσθαι.* "*ϝε*" crossed out again, and then "*νου ἐρέε*"

407. "*ϝοι*"

408. *τοι* "2, 30 *τιν*'". *τοι* is supported by one of his MSS; the others have *τιν*'.

409. *ἐὸν.* "*ϝε*" crossed out again.

411. *ἐώκει.* "*ϝε*" crossed out again.

414. "*ἀγγελίης ἔτι πεύθομαι* Od. B 255" and "Eust. esse potest *ἀγγελίης*, cas. gen."

415. *ἦν τινα.* "*ἤν τινα*" from MSS.

418. *Μέντης Ἀγχιάλοιο.* "*δ*'" is supplied after *Μέντης* from MSS.

419. *φιληρέτμοισιν ἀνάσσει.* "*σι ϝα*"

422. *ἕσπερον.* "*ϝέ*"

423. *ἕσπερος.* "*ϝέ*" *μέλας.* "Aeolice *μελαις*: vide *σ̄* 303." (*σ* 306)

424. *οἰκόνδε.* "*ϝοῖ*" *ἕκαστος.* "*ϝέ*"

425. "*ϝοι*"

428. *κέδν*' *εἰδυῖα.* "*να ϝιδ*"

432. *ἴσα.* "*ϝῖ*"

434. "*ϝοι*" "*ϝε*"

443. "Hesyc. *οἰὸς ἀώτῳ*, etc."

444. *φρεσὶν ἦσιν.* "*σι ϝῆ*"

β.

1. δ' ἠριγένεια. "δϝη"

22. "σχολ. διχῶς Ἀρίσταρχος, δύο δ' ἄλλα, δύο δ' αἰέν"

33. "Hesyc. ὀνήμονος" i.e. Hesychius to be corrected to ὀνήμενος.

40. δ' εἴσεαι. "ϝει" (i.e. read τάχα ϝείσεαι for τάχα δ' εἴσεαι).

41. λαὸν ἤγειρα. "λαοὺς" referring to 13 and 252 for the plural.

44. οὐδ' ἀγορεύω. "ἠδ'" from L.

46. ἀπώλεσα, ὅς ποτ' ἐν ὑμῖν. "εσσ'" (ἀπώλεσσ')

48. "Hes. οἶκος, τὰ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, Νῦν δ' αὖ, etc."

50. μητέρι μοι. In margin "Μητρὶ μεῇ", under this "Μητέρι μὲν", at top of page "ut μητρὶ σῇ Od. π. 469. υ. 334"

52. μὲν ἐς οἶκον. "πρὸς ϝοι Il. ε. 907"

54. οἱ. "ὅ ϝοι", at foot "C καὶ ὅς οἱ"

56. ὅις. "ὄϝις"

57. πίνουσί τε. "σίν τ'"

58. "L καταίνεται (Hesych. ταν) ῡ 537". (Hesych. κατάν. not καταίν.)

70. καί μ' οἷον. "μή μ'", but at top of page "pro μὴ οἷον", meaning that on second thoughts he takes καὶ μ' οἷον as = καὶ μὴ οἷον.

91. ῥ' ἔλπει. "ϝέλ"

100. ὀλοὴ. "οϝὴ"

103. αὖτε πεπείθετο (sic Steph.) "αὖτ' ἐπεπ."

111. ὑποκρίνονται, ἵν' εἰδῇς. "θ' ἵνα ϝει"

114. καὶ ἀνδάνει. "ὁ ϝαν" i. e. καὶ ὃ ϝανδάνει.

120. Ἀλκμήνη τε ἐϋπλόκαμός (sic Steph.) τε Μυκήνη. In margin "ἥνη τ' ἠϋστέφανός τε", at top of page "ἐυστέφανός sic et Pausanias in Corinth. et Nicandri σχολ." At foot "$CLL_{2,3}$. εὐστέφανός τε".

126. ποθὴν. "θὴ" So Apollonius, i. e. Aristarchus according to Lehrs. Bentley's reading seems to be a conjecture.

133. αὐτὸς ἑκών. "δ, 649 ἐγὼν Il. γ, 66". Above this "η, 217, θ, 391, ζ, 126, 218". Read η, 237; these last four references are to the Odyssey. At foot of page "M ἑκὼν γρ. ἐγὼν."

144. "Hesyc. Δῶσι, cum *ι*"

152. δ' *ἰδέτην*. "*δϝι*" "Hesyc. Ὄσσοντο δ' ὄλεθρον"

154. *τ' οἰκία*. "*ϝοι*"

167. "Hesy. *εὐδείελον* etc. corr."

193. *ἀσχάλλῃς*. "fo. *ἀσχαλάῃς*. quaere"

195. *μητέρα ἠν*. "*ἐρ' ἐὴν, -τέρα ϝὴν*"

203. *οὐδέποτ' ἴσα*. "*οὐδ' ἔτι ϝῖσα, οὐδέποτ' αἶσα*"

211. *τά γ' ἴσασι*. "*ϝί*" "M *τὰ ἴσασι*"

212. *καὶ εἴκοσ'*. "*ἐει*", not *ἐϝεί*.

216. *ὄσσαν*. "*ϝο*" crossed out again.

222. "*ἐπικτέρεα* Hesych."

223. *ἔοικε*. "*ϝέ α. 292*"

230. *ἀγανὸς καὶ ἤπιος ἔστω*. "*ὅς τε*" i. e. *ἀγανός τε καὶ*.

232. *αἴσυλα*. "*ἀήσ*" i. e. *ἀήσυλα*.

236. *ἔρδειν*. "*ϝε*" crossed out again.

245. *μαχήσασθαι*. "*χεσσ*"

247. *δῶμα ἑὸν*. "*ϝε*" (*ϝεὸν*) crossed out; then "*δώμαθ*'[1] *ἑὰ* 258, 259", and at top of page again: "fo. *κατὰ δώμαθ' ἑὰ*"

263. *ἠεροειδέα*. "*οϝει*"

269. *φωνήσασ' ἔπεα*. "*σα ϝέπεα*"

300. "Etym. M. *κακῶς γράφεται θ' εὓοντας*. recte *θύοντας*"

311. "lego *ἀέκοντ' εὐφραίνεσθαί τε ϝέκηλον*" In margin first "*ἀϝέ*", then "*ἀκέοντα*". At foot "311 M. *ἀκέοντα. γρ. ἀέκοντα* Ῥιανός"

312. *ἢ οὐχ ἅλις*. "*οὐ ϝά*". *τὸ πάροιθεν*. "*τὸ πρόσθεν* Porph. XLIII." Porph. qu. Il. 284, 9 (Ludwich).

320. "*που* Porphyr. p. XLII". The other reading is *περ*.

327. *περ ἴεται*. "*γε ϝίεται*"

331. *αὖτ' εἵπεσκε*. "*αὖ ϝεί*"

332. δ' *οἶδ'*. "*ϝοῖ*"

366. "Hesych. *ἀλλογνωτῶν, ξείνων*, pro *τωι νωι*", i. e. Hesychius to be corrected to *ἀλλογνωτῷ, ξείνῳ*.

379. *ἔπειτά οἱ οἶνον*. "*ἔπειθ' ἡ ϝοῖ*"

389. *εἴρυσε*. "*ἕλκετο. νῆας ἅλαδ' ἕλκεμεν* passim".

394. δ' *ἴμεναι*. "*ϝί*"

417. *ἕζετο· ἄγχι δ' ἄρ' αὐτῆς*. "*-ονθ*'" "*γὰρ*" and at top

[1] ? from MSS.

of page "an *κᾄγχι παρ'*", i. e. read *ἕζοντ'· ἄγχι γὰρ* or *ἕζετο· κᾄγχι παρ'*.

426. *λευκὰ ἐϋστρέπτοισι.* "*κ' ἠϋστρ*" (*λεύκ' ἠϋστρ.*)

428. *μεγάλ' ἴαχε.* "*γα ϝι*" i. e. *μέγα ϝίαχε.*

434. "Hesyc. *Ἠὼς, τὸ λυκόφως, πανυχίη* etc."

γ.

7. *δ' ἐν ἑκάστῃ.* "*δὲ ϝε*"

10. *κατάγοντο ἰδ'.* "*τ', ἠδ'*" (*κατάγοντ' ἠδ'*).

20. In margin "328", to defend *ψεῦδος* against *ψεύδεα.*

27. *οὐ γὰρ ὀΐω.* "fo. *ἦ γὰρ ὀΐω*"

40. *ἐν δ' οἶνον.* "*δροῖνον, καὶ ϝοῖνον*". At top of page "*καὶ ϝοῖνον*"

46. "leg. *δέπαι μελιϝηδέα ϝοῖνον.* vel *μελιήδεϊ ϝοίνῳ Σπεῖσαι·*" but in margin "*κ*, 316 *μέλανος ϝοίνοιο*". If this last is right it must mean that *κ* 316 is quoted for *δέπαι*, the dative, and that *μέλανος ϝοίνοιο* is an alternative correction for *μελιήδεος οἴνου*, keeping *δέπας.*

51. *ἡδέος οἴνου.* "*ἀμφικύπελλον* 63"

60. *πρήξαντα.* "*τε*"

64. *ἠρᾶτο.* "*ἠρήσατ'*"

77. *ἀποιχομένοιο ἔροιτο.* "*ϝε*" crossed out again. Then "*ου ἐρέοιτο*"

81. *Ὑπονηΐου.* "*α* 186" and "Etym. M. *Νηίτης. ὑπὸ νηΐιον*"

127. "Hes. *Ἐβαίνομεν, ἐλέγομεν* pro *Ἐβάζομεν*"

143. *ἐήνδανε.* "*ἐϝάν*"

151. "Hes. *ἀέσσαμεν.* male"

164. *ἦρα.* "*ϝῆ*"

175. *τάχιστα ὑπέκ.* "*τάχιστ' ἄρ'*" to avoid hiatus.

179. "Il. *α*, 464 etc."

185. "Hesyc. *Ἐσάωθεν* et *Ἐσιώθην.* corr." (corrigendum *ἐσιώθην*).

198. *ὅς οἱ.* "*ὅ ϝοι*"

206. "Hes. *Ὑπέρβασις*"

208. *οὔ μοι.* "fo. *οὔτοι*"

216. *δ' οἱδ'.* "*δροῖ*"

217. *ὅ γε.* "*σύ γε*"

232—238. Bracketed.

233. *ἰδέσθαι.* "*ἱκέσθαι*, ut *θ*, 236 *ἐπὶ γῆρας ἵκετο. ρ*, 497 *ἐύθρονον ἠῶ ἵκοιτο*". Read *θ*, 226.

244—246. Bracketed.

260. Ἄργεος preferred to *ἄστεος*.

264. *θέλγεσκ' ἐπέεσσιν.* "*σκε ϝέπεσσιν*"

266. "Eust. alij *κέκρητ'*. i. e. *συνεκέκρατο, ἀνεμέμικτο*"

271, 272. "Strabo pag. 16 *κάλλιπε, τὴν δ' ἐθέλουσαν* etc."

290. *ἶσα ὄρεσσιν.* "*ϝῖσ' ὀρέεσσιν* ut *βελέεσσιν*"

290. "Eust. *τροφόεντα*, alij *τροφέοντα*. Didym. *τροφέοντο*. Hesych. *τροφόεντα*"

293. "*λίσσῃ. Κράτης σὺν τῷ ῑ γράφει* Βλισσὴν, ut *σωλήν*" The quotation is from Eustathius, q. v.

293. *αἰπεῖά τε.* "*αἰπεινή τ'*"

295. *ποτὶ.* "*περὶ*". *γρ. περὶ* ed. Steph. in marg.

296. "Eust. *γράφεται καὶ Μαλείου δὲ λίθος*. Citat Suidam. vide....*Μάλεος*. Didym. *Μαλέου δὲ λίθος*" I cannot read the word after *vide*.

305. *δ' ἤνασσε.* "*δ' ϝή*" corrected afterwards to "*δ' ἐϝάν*"

308. *ὅς οἱ.* "*ὅ ϝοι*"

316. "Hes. *τηυσίην. Σὺ δὲ* etc." i. e. Hesychius quotes the words s. v. *τηϋσίην*.

319. *οὐκ ἔλποιτο.* "*οὐ ϝέλ*"

320. "Hesych. *Ἀποσφήλωσιν*"

322. *αὐτόετες.* In margin "*ορετεις*", at top of page "leg. *αὐτοέτεις*"

347. "Hes. *ὡς*"

364. *ὁμηλικίῃ* (sic Steph.) "*ιη*"

367. "Strabo 342 Pro *οὔ τι νέον γε Οὐδ'* alij legunt *Ἠλιδι δίῃ Οὐκ*"

372. *πάντας ἰδόντας.* "*τα. τα*" (*πάντα ϝιδόντα*) "vel *ὁρῶντας* 27, 6" (Hymn 27, 6, now 28, 6).

380. "Hesyc. *Ἀλλ' ἄναξ, ἐξόδιον τοῦ κιθαρῳδοῦ τὸ καθαπάδον καὶ τὸ Νῦν*. lege *Ἀλλὰ ϝάνασσ'* (ex hoc loco), *καὶ τὸ καί θ' ἁπαλὸν* (*γελάσαι*) *καὶ τὸ Νῦν δὲ θεοί*. vide Hesyc. *Νῦν*, non est Homeri" *Νῦν δὲ θεοὶ* is quoted by Hesychius as *ἐξόδιον τραγῳδῶν*, not of Homer. But how does Bentley mean his

wonderfully ingenious *καί θ' ἁπαλὸν γελάσαι* (ξ 465) to be got in as an *ἐξόδιον*?

387. *γαμβροῖσιν ἑὰ.* "*ϝεὰ*"

388. *δώμαθ' ἵκοντο ἀγακλυτὰ.* In margin "*ἱκοίατ' ἵκανον*" at top of page "fo. *ἱκοίατ'* Il. Σ 544. fo. *περικλυτά*"

419. "M. *ἱλασκόμεθ'*. lego *ἱλασώμεθ'*"

427. *ἀολλέες, εἵπατε.* "*λεῖς ϝει*"

432. "Hesyc. *τεύχεα—ἦλθε δὲ χ.*" (*χαλκεύς*).

435. *εἰργάζετο.* "*ϝερ—ται*" Cp. n. on *a* 263.

436. "Athen. 9 lib. *ἀντήσουσα.* sed *ἀντιόων ἑκατόμβης*" Athenaeus VIII. 363 (Ludwich).

444. "Hesyc. Ἄμνιον et *Δάμνια*"

449. *πέλεκυς.* "an *κυι*?"

480. *ὄψα τε οἷα ἔδουσι.* "fo. *ὄψων θ' οἷ' ἂν ἔδωσι.* vel *ὄψα τ' ὁποῖ' ἔσθουσι.* vel *ὄψα τ' ὁποῖ' ἂν ἔδωσι*"

486. "M. *θεῖον γρ. σεῖον* et Strabo 367. H. *Ἀριστοφ. θεῖον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔτρεχον.* Hes. *Σεῖον ζύγον*"

489. "vide Strabonem p. 367 et Pausaniam initio Messen."

494. "Dele v. 494 et insere v. ex MSS". But it is 493 that is absent from the MSS, as Bentley himself notes from his own CLM. "494 delet H" however. I cannot guess what is meant by *insere v. ex MSS.*

δ.

1. "*κητώεσσαν,* Zenodotus et alij *Καιετάεσσαν* Eustath. et Strabo. Hesych. utrumque"

4. *ἀμύμονος ᾧ.* "*-ονα ϝῷ*" and "*ἀμύμονος* Athen. p. 185"

15. *ἐπειδὴ.* "*Εππ*"

15—20. Bracketed. *ἀθετοῦνται* hi quinque, inserta ab Aristarcho ex Iliad. Σ 604, Athen. lib. 4. qui v. 19 legit *ἐξάρχοντος*" Athenaeus v 180, 181 (Ludwich).

32. "*ϝὼς*"

38. "*γρ. ἐπισπέσθαι.* Apoll. *σχολ.* 1, 893 ut Il. *ν* 495 *ἐπισπόμενον ἑοῖ αὐτῷ*" (Apoll. Rhod.)

43. "Athen. lib. 4. *Αὐτοὶ δ' εἰσῆλθον*" Athenaeus v 179 (Ludwich).

57, 58. Bracketed.

60 "*σίτου δ' ἅπτεσθον.* Ath. lib. 5" v 188 (La Roche).

61. *δείπνου.* "an *δόρπου. γ* 497, *δ* 213. 194" *γ* 497 is quoted to shew the time of day.

72. *καὶ δώματα.* "*κατὰ* 46"

74. "Sic Lucianus *Περὶ κάλλους.* Athen. lib. 5 Seleucus legit, *Ζηνός που τοιαῦτα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται.* Illud ab Aristarcho. Idem ex illo Eustath."

84. "Strabo p. 41. Zeno Stoicus legebat *σιδ—ἄραβάς τε.* et p. 299 et 784. Et Eust. Etym. M. Crates legit *ἐρεμνοὺς* hoc est Indos. Et Eustath. *Ἀρίσταρχος ἐρεμνούς*"

87. *οὔτε ἄναξ.* "*οὔ τι* 163"

89. "Hesyc. *Νᾶσαι, προβαλεῖν, ἐπηέτανον γάλα νᾶσαι, ἢ ῥεῖν.* vide *Ναύει*" *Ναύει, ῥέει βλύζει.* Hesych.

90. *ἕως ἐγώ.* "*ἕως ποτ' που ἄρ'*" i. e. insert either *ποτ'* or *που* or *ἄρ'*.

116. "*χειρεσιν ἀμφοτέρῃσι*"

120. *ἕως ὅ.* "*ὅ γε*"

121. *Ἑλένη.* "*ϝελ*"

122. *εἰκυῖα.* "*ϝει*"

126. *δάμαρ.* "*αρς*" (*δάμαρς, ὃς κ.τ.λ.*)

128. *δῶκε.* "*ἔδω*"

130. *αὖθ' Ἑλένῃ.* "*αὖ ϝε*"

131. *χρυσῆν.* "*σέην*"

137. "*ἤ γε ϝέπεσσι*"

148. *εἴσκεις.* "*ϝεἰ*"

159. *τὸ πρῶτον ἐπεσβολίας.* "*τὰ πρῶτα ϝεπ.* Il. B. 275" Then he crosses this out and corrects *ἐπεσβολίας* to *ἐπιστομίας.* "Eust. *Ζηνόδοτος ἐπιστομίας, ὥς φασιν οἱ σχολιασταί*"

160. "*ϝὼς*"

183. *ὑφ' ἵμερον.* "Arist. Rhet. 1, 43. *ἐφ' ἵμερον*" (Rhet. 1. xi. 12, but modern editors read *ὑφ'* in Aristotle also.)

208. *γεινομένῳ.* "*ναμ*", i. e. *γειναμένῳ.* "Eust. ad locum et *η* p. 281 *τινὲς γεινομένῳ* hic *γεννῶντι*" (*η* 198)

215. "Hes. *Τηλεμάχῳ καὶ* etc."

220. *εἰς οἶνον.* "*ἐς ϝοῖ*"

221. "Hesyc. *Ἄχολον* etc—*ἐπίληθον.* Dio Chrys. Or. XII *ἐπίληθες.* Et Clemens Alleg. Protrep. Plut. vita Hom." These passages are not referred to by La Roche or Ludwich, except that from Plutarch.

226. δηϊόῳεν. "ὀϝω"

229. "Theoph. 9, 15, τόθι πλεῖστα φύει et 231 τετυγμένα" Read 230.

231. "leg. Ἰητροὶ 729" and in margin "οι—οι" (ἰητροὶ δὲ ϝέκαστος ἐπιστάμενοι for ἰητρὸς δε ἕκαστος ἐπιστάμενος).

247. "ἐϝείσκε"

248. "vide Hesych. ὃς οὐδέν" and "Hes. ὃς οὐδ' ἐν τοῖος ἔην" i.e. corr. Hesych. to οὐδέν.

258. "Hesyc. κατὰ δὲ φρόνιν etc. et φρόνιν" i.e. Hes. quotes this line under both κατὰ δὲ φ. and φρόνιν.

277. κοῖλον. "Hesyc."

287. "Hesyc. Ἐπιμάστακα etc." to be corrected to ἐπὶ μάστακα.

319. "Hes. πλεῖος—Ἀνδρῶν δυσμ. π." for δυσμενέων δ' ἀνδρῶν πλεῖος. Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

322. "γ 92"

338. ἔπειτα ἑήν. ."τ' ἄρ'" i.e. ἔπειτ' ἄρ' ἑήν.

343. "Hes. φιλομηδιάδης" Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

348. πάρεξ εἴποιμι. "εκ ϝει"

352. ἐπεὶ οὔ. "ὅ τ'" (ὅ τ' οὔ.)

356. ἄνευθ' ὅσσον τε. "θεν ὅσον κε"

358. "Strabo p. 337 ἐπὶ" for ἀπό. Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

361. "ἁλιϝάεες"

363. καί νύ κεν ἤια πάντα. "κε πάντ' ἤια"

380. "469"

404. "Ἁλοσύδνης, τῆς θαλάσσης ὕδωρ. Hesyc. dele ὕδωρ"

407. ἀγαγοῦσα ἄμ'. "σ' ἄρ'" (ἀγαγοῦσ' ἄρ' ἅμ'.)

408. σὺ δ' εὖ (sic Steph.) κρίνασθαι. "δέ τ'" in margin (δέ τ' εὖ); at top of page "fo. σὺ δ' ἐὺ κρι. recte"

416. αὖθι δ' ἔχειν. "κὰδ δ' ἐχέμεν" (κὰδ δ' ἔχειν Eust.)

417. ὅσσ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν. "Proclus in Polit. Plat. p. 38 ὅσσ' ἐπὶ γαίης" Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

421. ἴδησθε. "an θα" and "HLM ἴδηαι"

438. "Etym. M. γλαφυρὸς—διαγλάψασ', sed in γράμμα habet διαγράψασ'"

454. *δ' αἶψ' ἰάχοντες.* "*δὲ ϝιά*"

461. "*με ϝέπεσσι*"

475. *τ' ἰδέειν.* "*ϝι*"

484. *μιν ἔπεσσιν.* "*ϝέπεσίν μιν*" and under this "*ϝε ϝέπεσσιν*"

511. Bracketed, after note of Eustathius.

513. *πότνια Ἥρη.* "*ϝή*" (*ϝήρη*)

524. *εἶδε.* "*ϝει*"

534. *οὐκ εἰδότ'.* "*οὐ ϝει*"

543. *μηκέτι Ἀτρέος.* "*τ' ὦ Ἀτρ*" and under this "*μή τί μοι*"

556. *δ' ἴδον.* "*ϝι*"

568. "Pind. *σχολ. ἀνίησι παραψυχὴν ἀνθρώποις*"

577. *πάμπρωτον ἐρύσσαμεν.* "*τα ϝε*"

588. "*τ.* 192"

596. *κέ μ' οἴκου.* "*με ϝοί*"

607. "Strabo 454 pro *ἱππήλατος* habet *εὐδείελος*"

613. "an leg. *δῶρον*? Eust. *Δῶρον δ' ὅσσα, δύναται διχῶς γράφεσθαι δῶρον ἢ δώρων*"

649. *ἑκὼν.* "*β* 133 *ἐγὼ*"

652. "Recte *ἡμέας*, *Inter* nos. Vide Od. *π*, 419. Male Barn. *ὑμέας*"

654. Μέντορα "*γ'*" *ἠὲ*

669. *καὶ εἰκόσ'.* "*ἐεί*"

670. *αὐτὸν.* "*αὖτις.* Iliad. *α.* 27"

672. *ναυτίλλεται.* "*λητ'*"

682. *ἢ εἰπέμεναι.* "*ϝειπέ*" or "*ἢ ϝειπεῖν*"

698. *μείζόν τε.* "*τι. ε*, 187. *β*, 32, 44, 144" The last appears to be a mistaken reference.

704. *τῶ δέ οἱ ὄσσε.* "*ϝω*" apparently. *ϝοι*?

706. *ὄψε δὲ δή μιν ἔπεσσιν.* "*ϝε ϝεπ*" or "*δέ μιν*" (*ὄψε δέ μιν ϝεπέεσσιν*).

712. *οὐκ οἶδ'.* "*οὐ ϝοῖδ'*"

727. "*ε*, 18"

740. *ὀδύρεται.* "*ρητ'*"

744. *ἢ ἔα ἐν μεγάρῳ.* "fo. *Ἥδεα γ'*"

758. *γόον.* "*χόλον*" or "*κότον*"

762. *κλῦθί μοι.* "*μευ*"

772. *οὐκ ἴσαν.* "*οὐ ϝί*"
775. *πάντας.* "*τες*"
793. *ἐπέλλαβε* (sic Steph.) "*κ*, 31. *ν*, 281" (*ν* 282).
796. "*δὲ ϝείκτο*"
800. *εἴ πως.* "*Εἴως ζ*, 80"
802. "Hes. *παρὰ κληῖδος ἱμάντα*"
805. *οὐδὲ ἐῶσι.* "*οὐδ' εἰῶσι*"
809. "Hesyc. *Ὀνειρείῃσι πύλῃσι* etc."
811. *πώλε'.* "*πώλεαι*"
812. "*κέλεαι ε*, 174"
831. *τε ἔκλυες.* "*τ' ἄρ'*"

IPHIGENIA AND EKATOMBH.

Iphigenia.

It is a trite observation that the sacrifice of Iphigenia is unknown to Homer, though presumably the Iphianassa of the ninth *Iliad* is to be identified with her, as she certainly was by Lucretius. The obvious conclusion to be drawn is that the story arose at some time between Homer and Aeschylus, and I felt no trouble about this until I read Prof. Robertson Smith's brilliant work on the Religion of the Semites. There (p. 383) occurs the following remark. "The Greeks in like manner commenced their wars with piacular sacrifices of the most solemn kind; indeed, according to Phylarchus, a human victim was at one time deemed indispensable; but this probably means no more than that the offerings made on such an occasion were of the exceptional and sacrosanct character with which legends of actual human sacrifice are so frequently associated. One illustration of Phylarchus's statement will occur to every one, viz. the sacrifice of Iphigenia; and here it is to be noted that, while all forms of the legend are agreed that Agamemnon must have committed some deadly sin, before so terrible an offering was required of him, there is no agreement as to what his sin was. It is not therefore unreasonable to think that in the original story the piaculum was simply the ordinary preliminary to a campaign, and that later ages could not understand why such a sacrifice should be made, except to atone for mortal guilt."

After careful consideration I entirely agree with the views here stated or implied (1) that all human sacrifice is a substitu-

tion for sacrifice of a divine animal (or perhaps plant), the primitive idea of a sacrifice being a communion with the totem god by partaking of its body and blood, for which I must refer the reader to Prof. Robertson Smith's book, (2) that the particular legend of Iphigenia was derived from a piaculum before war.

This being so, how is it that a legend so archaic in its character that Aeschylus did not understand it was unknown to Homer[1]? Had it been modern in character, we could easily see that it might be a late developement; that idea is forbidden by the story itself.

It is noteworthy that Homer, though he knows nothing of the sacrifice, yet does represent the Greek fleet as sailing from Aulis, and as offering a sacrifice there before starting on the expedition, with omens which at once recall to mind the omens there related by Aeschylus. (B. 303 seqq.) We have then the legend of the Greek fleet at Aulis and sacrifice there before the war on the one hand, on the other we have a legend from Aulis of a human sacrifice connected with a deer in some way. If the two were originally distinct, what more natural than that they should have been afterwards combined together in one story? And that they were originally distinct is clear from the consideration, that the legend of human sacrifice is manifestly extremely ancient, and yet that Homer does not connect it with the Trojan war.

This amalgamation of distinct legends is one of the most familiar and most troublesome features of mythology. There is scarcely a god of Greece who is not pieced together out of half a dozen animals and local gods, and whose attributes are not derived from a number of local and contradictory tales.

What then was this original legend of sacrifice at Aulis? When we look at the account of Aeschylus we find that two eagles, symbolizing the two Atridae, slay a pregnant hare and thereby give an omen that Artemis is wroth with them; to turn away her anger Iphigenia is sacrificed. Why then was Artemis angry? It is useless to try and find out from Aeschy-

[1] That it was unknown to him seems clear from the fact that he represents Iphianassa as alive; otherwise his silence would not go for much.

lus; like Pindar or Herodotus on similar occasions he prefers not to tell us. But what Aeschylus, with great gain, chose to leave wrapped in the gloom of the thunder cloud, this Sophocles with singular frigidity has dragged into the light of day; he tells us plainly that it was because Agamemnon had killed a stag sacred to Artemis! There is a reason for you! However the mythologist may be thankful when the reader of poetry is disgusted. And the later (if later) story which substitutes a deer for Iphigenia again shews the same thing, that the sacrifice of Iphigenia is closely connected with a deer sacrifice.

Now it is a perpetual feature in sacrificial rites to find an animal sacrificed as a man; I need only quote the famous instance of the bull at Tenedos which wore a cothurnus on its foot and represented a human victim. Some sacrifices were especially sacred; they were made generally at a yearly festival, and the identification of the victim with a human being only marked their peculiar sanctity. We may fairly then guess that the sacrifice at Aulis was a very holy sacrifice of a deer, which, as so often, was said to be a human being by the common confusion of ideas among early peoples. For the deer and its worshippers are all members of one kin, they are all deer or commonly the deer are men. This deer would be originally itself the god and its worshippers would eat it as a sacramental rite; then it would be connected with the worship of one of the higher deities when they became popular; in this case it was connected with Artemis. When the idea that the animal itself was the god became too absurd, because the totem system and the ideas derived from it were obsolete, the deer became simply an offering to the new anthropomorphic goddess, but, as with the bull at Tenedos, its life was regarded as the life of the tribe and itself as in some sort a human victim[1]. Hence the idea that it was a substitute. For what? The mythologist looked round him; he saw there at Aulis the fleet starting for the Trojan war, and solemn sacrifice being offered; he naturally said that this holy sacrifice of the deer was a commemoration of that ancient occasion. And the deer being human also, he naturally concluded that at the original sacrifice

[1] See Religion of the Semites 343 etc.

the victim was actually human. Could more proof be required? Agamemnon had manifestly offered a human victim, and as in the Hebrew myth of Jephthah or the common Semitic offerings to Baal-Melek, the most efficacious victim was of course his own child. Now Homer gave him four children; Orestes could not be taken, so the choice had to fall on one of his three daughters, and Iphianassa was chosen, probably as supposed to be the oldest[1].

So it was that Homer knew nothing of the story which Aeschylus and Lucretius have immortalized in verses of such heart-piercing beauty; "tantum relligio potuit suadere—poetis."

ἑκατόμβη.

It is to Prof. Robertson Smith again that I owe the hint which led to this note. "The lexicons apply the name *fara'*... also to the sacrifice of one beast in a hundred, which is what the scholiast above cited understands by the 'atira." (page 210 *op. cit.*) Having long felt much dissatisfied with the notion that a "hecatomb" in Homer could have ever had anything to do with a hundred victims, I gladly seized on this; why should not ἑκατόμβη also mean "the hundredth victim"?

Let us first see on what the traditional idea is based. Apparently, if one may trust Ebeling, on nothing but Byzantine etymological conjecture! Thus Hesychius explains the word as *θυσία ποτὲ μὲν ἑκατὸν βοῶν*, and the *Et. Mag.* supplies the alternative *ἀπὸ ἑκατὸν βημάτων ὅ ἐστι κε' ζώων*, so that a hecatomb would be twenty-five quadrupeds. Really the latter is the more attractive of the two, for it would be more like Greek usage and one may as well derive *-βη* from *βῆμα* as from *βοῦς*. There is no authority then at all for the idea that ἑκατόμβη ever meant a hundred animals of any kind.

To turn to the Greek usage, we find that nowhere does Homer speak of a hundred animals being sacrificed. In γ. 59

[1] It appears from Schol. Aristoph. Lysistrata 645 that another version connected the Iphigenia legend with Brauron, not Aulis. At Brauron she seems to be a bear-goddess.

indeed, at a very solemn occasion when all Pylos had met together to celebrate their bull-feast to Poseidon, eighty-one bulls are offered up. In Ψ. 146, say the lexicons, there is a hecatomb of fifty rams; I deny it, Homer speaks of "a sacred hecatomb *and* fifty rams," so that the two sacrifices are distinct. The next highest number is only twelve (Z. 115 collato 93), and they unfortunately are described as ἑκατόμβας not ἑκατόμβην, so that only six at most can be allowed for a single hecatomb there. Would you not say from this passage that a ἑκατόμβη was a *victim?* However I do not think that ἑκατόμβη can ever be shewn to be only a single victim, and it certainly over and over again includes several. But of all the many passages in which the word occurs only γ. 59 can be quoted to shew that it meant anything extraordinary in point of number; sacrifices of very few animals are continually called "hecatombs." Surely the Homeric usage is of weight in deciding the question if anything is.

How a hecatomb differed from an ordinary slaughter of a beast for food, which also appears to be in its origin a sacrifice invariably (e.g. ξ. 74, and compare Robertson Smith, p. 263), may be easily gathered from comparison of the Homeric instances. These are first propitiatory, as A. 315 etc. to avert the plague, Z. 115 to turn away the anger of Athena from Troy, γ. 144, δ. 582, λ. 132 copied in ψ. 279. Secondly solemn feasts at stated seasons, as especially *Hymn* xxxiv. 12; compare *a*. 25, the solemn feast of the Aethiopians to Poseidon, copied in Ψ. 206, in γ. 59 a very solemn feast of all the Pylians to Poseidon, in *v*. 276 the feast day of Apollo in Ithaca. Thirdly hecatombs are promised to the gods if they will help in any definite undertaking, as Δ. 102, 120, copied in Ψ. 864, 873, or Ψ. 146 when we hear that Achilles had offered a hecatomb to Spercheus if he should return safe, ρ. 50, 59: so at the beginning of a great undertaking, as at Aulis, B. 306, 321; so Menelaus ought to have offered hecatombs before starting back for Greece, δ. 352, and the Greeks on building their wall, H. 450, M. 6. Fourthly as thanksgiving at a harvest feast, I. 535, to all the gods. The only cases that do not come under these heads definitely are ε. 102, η. 202, ν. 350, τ. 366, which

are all vague, but do not appear to refer to ordinary sacrifices; as for Θ. 548 it is extremely doubtful whether it ought to be printed in the *Iliad* at all, and there scarcely seems sufficient reason there for hecatombs.

Now it is on just such occasions as these that tithes, (taking the word to mean selected victims, not necessarily one in every *ten*), are offered to the gods. At the same time such occasions are just those on which a specially *valuable* sacrifice would be offered, and therefore a hecatomb would easily come to imply a great number of victims, whence by false etymology a hundred. At least Clisthenes sacrifices *βοῦς ἑκατὸν* in Herodotus vi. 129, which looks as if so early as this *ἑκατόμβη* was supposed to mean a hundred oxen. Even in Homer we have already found eighty-one sacrificed at a time, so that there was not much further to go. We can now see that the ordinary explanation—"properly an offering of a hundred oxen, but even in Hom. the word has lost its etymol. sense, and come to signify a great public sacrifice" L. and S.—is exactly the wrong way round. Originally a sacrifice of the hundredth *animal*, hence any particularly solemn offering, it ended by false etymology in becoming a sacrifice of a hundred *oxen*.

Let us go back to the quotation from Hesychius which I left interrupted above. *ποτὲ μὲν ἑκατὸν βοῶν*, says he, *ποτὲ δὲ βοὸς καὶ προβάτου καὶ αἰγός*. It is unnecessary to point out how impossible it is to reconcile this latter aspect of the sacrifice with the traditionary explanation. But how simple it is if the *ἑκατόμβη* was the *'atira*. An owner of cattle would sacrifice the hundredth not only of his kine, but also of his sheep and goats, and so a *ἑκατόμβη* might naturally enough come to mean *one* of each. The omission of the pig is like the omission of the goat in the *suovetaurilia*, to secure the mystic number three; the comparison is significant with regard to the position of the animals in Greece and Italy.

ARTHUR PLATT.

ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF AESCHYLUS.

It is now a commonplace of criticism that the first step towards the restoration of the text of any author must be the determination of the genealogical relation, if any, obtaining between the manuscripts which contain his works. The different traditions are thus distinguished one from the other, the principal manuscripts of each tradition regarded as authorities, to the exclusion of all others; it often happening that these in their turn can be referred to some lost archetype, which, in so far as it can be reconstructed from their evidence, becomes the basis of criticism. In this procedure, since historical testimony fails us, our arguments must be based on the discrepancies in reading of the manuscripts under consideration. Dindorf would seem to deny this (pref. to Teubner's edition p. VII, 'quo argumento solo quum non multum efficiatur' cet.), but as I have been unable, and in truth not very anxious, to obtain sight of his arguments and method, I have been fain to content myself with the following rules; which, I believe are those adhered to by Lachmann and Madvig, the masters in this department of criticism.

1. When one manuscript agrees with another not only in the more important errors, but also in such minutiae as misspellings, wrong division of words, etc., and only differs from it to present readings which are easily seen to be either corruptions or blundering attempts at correction of its readings; then we are fully justified in regarding it as a copy of the latter.

2. When two manuscripts agree in many of the more important, and even in some of the less important, errors, but

present a fair number of discrepancies which cannot be referred one to the other as to its original, but can be regarded as variations of some common original reading, then the manuscripts are to be looked upon as descendants, direct or indirect, of the same archetype.

3. But when the two manuscripts differ to such an extent that it is impossible to derive their readings either one from the other or both from a common source, then we can only consider them representatives each of a tradition too different from the other for us to discover their original point of divergence.

With the aid of these rules we shall examine the discrepancies between those manuscripts which contain the tragedies of Aeschylus.

§ 1.

The prevalent opinion, which I venture to call in question, is that the manuscript in the Laurentian library at Florence XXXII 9, the well-known *Mediceus*, is the original of all others now in existence, that the variations which these present are due either to sleepy copyists or to Bentley's bungling tinkers; and that even when the latter manuscripts present the true reading, it is due merely to a grammarian's guess a little more happy than usual. This theory, announced by Burges in 1821, has received the support of great names; Wilhelm Dindorf and Cobet have given unreserved assent to it, Kirchhoff regards it as 'extra omnem dubitationis aleam positum,' Wecklein after long doubting has at last entered the fold, and Dr Verrall, if not so certain of its absolute truth, has at least bound himself to this theory by basing the text of his brilliant edition of Aeschylus entirely on the *Mediceus*. The opponents are few: their efforts have been merely directed to showing 'non omnia pendere ex libro antiquissimo, sed etiam ceteris codicibus aliquid tribuendum esse' (Weil pref. to Teubner's ed. p. VI); the nearest approach that I know to a definite statement of a counter-theory being M. Haupt's ambiguously-expressed opinion

in his preface to Hermann's posthumous edition p. IX, 'generis a Mediceo libro diversi communione tres distant codices'; these three being the well-known *Florentinus*, *Venetus*, and *Farnesianus*. In the face of these attempts it is no wonder that a theory expressed with such definiteness of statement and such confidence of iteration as the common theory is, should have won the day; and therefore it is that in the absence of some better champion I take it upon myself to challenge the prevalent opinion.

The lacunae existing in the various manuscripts do not help us very far towards a settlement of the question. It is true that the omission by the manuscripts G (*codex Guelferbytanus*), C (*codex Marcianus*), and R (the manuscript of Robortello) of vv. 323—1050[1] and 1159—1673 of the Agamemnon and the opening of the Choephori, verses formerly present in M but now lost through mutilation of that manuscript, proves the former to be late copies of the latter. But that B (*codex Bessarionis*) possesses 360 verses of the Agamemnon, that F and N (*Florentinus* and *Farnesianus*) possess the whole of that tragedy, and that V (*Venetus*) formerly possessed it in full, though vv. 46—1079 are now missing, does not prove these manuscripts not to have been copied from M before its mutilation; nor does the omission by FV and N of vv. 587—647 and 797—826 of the Eumenides, while proving them to be copies of one and the same original, remove the possibility of that original being a copy of M. We must, therefore, if we are to gain anything definite, turn to the more ordinary discrepancies. Our field of inquiry is narrowed by two circumstances: firstly, as the greater part of the manuscripts contain merely the Prometheus, the Persians, and the Seven against Thebes, as they have passed through the hands of late Byzantine correctors, they must naturally be left out of count until we have considered the evidence of those manuscripts which present a clearer tradition; secondly, of these manuscripts (FVN, B) the readings are fully reported only in the Agamemnon (by Hermann, Kirchhoff, Wecklein) and the Eumenides (by Hermann), while in the other plays we have

[1] I adopt Wecklein's enumeration.

only rare mention of their readings scattered through the vast mass of worthless variants which disfigure the pages of Hermann's second volume. It will therefore be granted that our only possible course, if we are to arrive at satisfactory results, is to analyse the evidence offered by the Agamemnon and Eumenides, and to interpret the few recorded variants in the remaining tragedies in the light of the results obtained by that analysis.

To examine the case in its proper order, we shall first of all take those readings which show the manuscripts to be all of the same family; namely those errors which are common to all of them, and which in the Agamemnon are the following: 69 *ὑποκλαίων*, 91 *δώροις*, 103 *λύπης φρένα*, 111 *δίκας πράκτορι*, 131 *ἄτα*, 165 *τόδε*, 170 *οὐδὲν λέξαι*, 212 *τί πῶς λιπόναυς τε*, 246 *αἰῶνα*, 250 *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν*, 275 *οὐ δόξαν*, 282 *ἀγγέλου*, 1079 *καὶ πεδορραντήριον*, 1080 *μαρτυρίοις*, *ἐπεπείθομαι*, 1103 *τί γ'*, 1109 *με*, 1144 *γὰρ οἱ*, 1146 *τ'*. It is of course evident that this consensus leaves it entirely undecided whether M or some lost manuscript is to be regarded as our archetype, and the same is to be said of the following passages where the manuscripts differ from one another: 2 *δ'* Mr[1] B, omitted by FVN; 26 *σημαίνω* Mr, *σημανῶ* B FVN; 29 *ἐπορθριάζειν* Mr B, *ἐπορθιάζειν* FVN; 40 *πριάμῳ* Mr B, *πριάμου* FVN; 80 *τρίποδας* Mr B, *τρίποδος* FN; 94 *χρίματος* Mr B, *χρίσματος* FN; 118 *οἱ* F, omitted by Mr B; 128 *λογοδαίτας* Mr B, *λαγοδαίτας* FN; 129 *ἀρχάς* Mr B, *ἀρχούς* FN; 146 *ἃ* FN, omitted by Mr B; 152 *τῶν* FN, omitted by Mr B; 161 *γὰρ* Mr B, omitted by FN; 167 *οἴκοις* Mr B, *οἴκος* F; 1080 *μὲν* FVN, omitted by Mr; 1132 *ἐπεγχέασα* Mr, *ἐπαγχέασα* FVN. It is here possible to explain the readings of B FVN as perversions or corrections of the readings of M, it is equally possible to explain them as errors or conjectures for the readings of the archetype of M, and that is all that can be said: these variants, considered alone, do not compel us to interpret them one way rather than the other, and depend for their explanation on passages where the evidence is more dis-

[1] By this symbol are denoted the remaining manuscripts.

tinct. We next come to a few passages where the differences between the manuscripts are peculiar enough to cause doubts concerning the ordinary opinion: 122 *ἐρικύματα φέρματι* Mr, *ἐρικύμονα φέρματι* B, *ἐρικύμονα φέρβοντο* FN; 266 *συνορθὸν* Mr B, *σύναρθρον* FN; 298 *ὑπερτελῆς* Mr B, *ὑπὲρ ἕλης* FN; 300 *χρυσοφεγγὲς* Mr FN, *γλυσοφεγγὲς* B; 1072 *εἰ σὺ μὴ τόδ'* Mr, *εἰ σὺ τὸ μήδ'* F; 1079 *ἂν εὑρήσῃ* Mr, *ἐφευρήσει* FN; 1081 *τάδε* Mr, *τὰ* FVN which Dr Verrall confesses to be strange, remarking that 'It would almost seem as if they (i.e. FVN) must in this place have been guided by some note or tradition independent of M, which has now disappeared'; 1144 *περιβαλοντο* Mr, *περιβάλοντες* FVN; 1153 *ἔχεις* Mr, *ἔχῃ* FV. Still there is no logical compulsion in any of these readings towards one theory rather than another, and they all remain *ἐν μεταιχμίῳ*, to be decided upon by the remainder of the evidence. And this latter is against the current opinion. The following examples are enough to decide: 6 *αἰθέρι* Mr FVN, *ἐν θέρει* (i.e. *ἔθερι*) B; 39 *αὐδῶ κού* Mr FVN, *αὐδῶν οὐ* B; 82 *ἡμερόφατον* Mr B, *ἡμερόφαντον* FN; 112 *τὰν γᾶν* Mr, *τάγαν* B FN; 156 *ἁπλοΐας* Mr B, *ἁπλοΐδας* FN; 165 *ἀπέκλαιξεν* M, *ἀπέκλαγξεν* B FN; 322 *τόγε σκήπτει* M, *τόδε σκήπτει* F, *τόδ' ἐνσκήπτει* B; 1079 *μαντεύει* M, *ματεύει* FN; 1089 *ἀλκὰ* M, *ἀλκὰν* FVN; 1151 *μελοτυπεῖς* MV, *μελοτυπεῖς* F, *μολοτυπεῖς* N. The fact that these variants are due to uncial writing and to the uncial compendium for *ν* fixes their source as earlier than M and inclines us to consider B FVN not as copies of M, but as derived from the same archetype as the latter. This opinion is confirmed by variants evidently due to a double reading in the archetype. Two of these stand out pre-eminent. In 143 M has *πτάκα*, FN *πτῶκα*, B *πτάωνκα*, the original being *πτακα*, and the combination of these two readings in B with the uncial compendium for *ν* precluding the supposition that they existed together first in some copy of M from which B FVN were derived. In 101 M has *φαίνεις*, B *φαίνει*, FN *φαίνουσ'*. I believe that the reading of B is correct and that the passage should thus run:

101 ἀγανὰ φαίνει
95 μαλακαῖς ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις,
102 Ἐλπὶς, ἀμύνειν κτλ.

v. 95 thus at last giving a satisfactory sense. The origin of the variants is thus clear. φαίνουσ' was written to avoid the hiatus[1], and the σ being written slightly lower than the rest of the letters, thus: ΦΑΙΝΕΙ$^{\text{ΟΥ}}_{\text{C}}$, was taken by the scribe of M to belong to φαίνει. The discrepancy must here again be referred to the archetype of M and not to a copy of the latter. Of the others the confusion existing in all the manuscripts as to the reading of v. 120 (παμπρέπτοις MB, παμπέποις mr, ἐν ἕδραισιν Mr B, παμπρέποισιν ἕδραις F, παμπρέπεσιν ἕδρας N) indicates something like ΠΑΜΠΡΕΠΤ$^{\text{IN}}$ΟΙCΕΝΕΔΡ$^{\text{IN}}$ΑΙC, and the confusion in M itself as to the τ in παμπρέπτοις refers us back again to its archetype for the origin of the variations. In 146 Dr Verrall explains the ἀέλπτοις of M as due to misunderstanding of a note λείπει τὸ λ referring to ἐόντων, and remarks 'M has ἀέλπτοις but its archetype had ἀέπτοις, like F': this we can believe, but it is scarcely credible that the scribe of F came by the true reading unless he had access to the archetype of M. By happy blunder he could not have written ἀέπτοις, nor would he have hit upon so rare a word by conjecture; he would have more likely guessed λέπτοις as some have since done. In 48 where M has κλάζοντες, FN κλάγξαντες, it is not easy to believe the latter reading a corruption or correction of the former. The double readings in 79 (τίθιπερηγήρως M, τόθιπερηγήρως FB, i.e. ὅ written above τί in the archetype), in 103 (θυμόφθορον MB, θυμόβορον FN), in 1131 (ταλαίναις φρεσὶν M, φιλοίκτοις ταλαιν' φρεσὶν FV, φιλοίκτοισι φρεσὶν N) can hardly have arisen at a later date than that at which M was written, and not being in M itself, must have been in its archetype. In the cases of v. 17 (ἐντέμνων Mr, ἐκτέμνων$^{\nu}$ F)

[1] This of course was caused in the usual way. V. 95 (or 101^{b}) was omitted in copying, then written in the margin, and afterwards inserted in the text in the wrong place.

and v. 64 (ἐρειδομένου M, ἐρειπομένου F, ἐρειπομένου N) it seems more reasonable to refer the variants to double readings in the common archetype of M and the other manuscripts due to annotation from some codex representing a distinct tradition, than to seek to explain them by the clumsy theory that they are changes (consciously or unconsciously made by later copyists) of the reading of M. The few following variations depend on the former for their explanation: 98 *αἰνεῖν* Mr B, *εἰπεῖν* FN; 275 *σιγῴσῃ* Mr B, *σιγῶντι* FN; 283 *φρονοῦντος* Mr B, *φρονούσης* FN.

It may be owing to a peculiar denseness on my part, but I utterly fail to see how the differences in reading between M and B FVN can be explained on the hypothesis of the latter being copies of the former. Rather, seeing that the manuscripts in question agree in certain errors, but diverge occasionally from each other in such a manner as to indicate a common original, the only course I perceive left open to me according to the rules laid down at the beginning is to regard them as descendants of the same archetype. They divide into three classes M, B, and FVN: the close relationship of FVN having been already seen, and the independent standing of B being proved by the fact that it sides now with M against FVN, now with the latter against M, and also by its possessing readings peculiar to itself such as those quoted above from vv. 101, 122, 143, 300, and 322. M I regard as a direct copy of the archetype, FVN are of course indirect descendants of it; the exact position of B is difficult to determine, though its reading in v. 143 would lead one to look upon it also as an indirect copy.

In the Eumenides it would be sheer waste of time and space to give all the evidence. There are of course a great many variations which prove nothing either way, and which the reader can easily discover for himself if he chooses to undertake the thankless task. I confine myself to those which support my theory. Of these the following are due to uncial writing: 46 λέχος Mr, λόχος FVN; 172 βρότεα Mr, βρέτεα FVN; 230 ἄγειν Mr, ἄγει FVN; 389 διχοστατοῦτ' Mr, διχο-

στατοῦντ' FVN; 330 μέλος Mr, μένος FVN; 405 τόκοις Mr, τέκνοις FVN; 434 πένῃ Mr, πέλῃ FVN; 453 καθαιμάξουσι ΝΟΘΗΛΟΥ βοτοῦ Mr, καθαιμάξουσιΝ ὀθνείου βροτοῦ FVN (where the false division in M points distinctly to the uncial source of the error); 479 εὐπέμπελον Mr, εὐπέπλον FV (this being a case of lipography complicated with the uncial compendium for ν); 545 ἀτίσῃς Mr, ἀντίσῃς FVN; 654 ἀσθμαίνω Mr, ἀσθμαίνων FVN; 705 οὔτις Mr, οὔποτ' FVN; 882 καμοῦμαι Mr, καλοῦμαι FVN; 915 πρέπτων Mr, τρέπτων FVN; 965 δομῷ Mr, δαίμω i.e. δεμῷ FVN. Of double readings there is only one which clearly shows its origin: in v. 54 where Burges correctly wrote λίβα M has διὰ, FVN βίαν; that is, the archetype had $\overset{\text{B}}{\text{λια}}$, the scribe of M ignored the B and evolved διὰ, the scribe of the other manuscript, from which FVN are copied, took the B for a correction of the λ and acutely wrote βίαν. Owing to the fact that B does not contain the Eumenides, we have no other double reading like those in Agam. 101, 143, distinctly pointing to the archetype of the three families as its source; for the following διττογραφίαι (170 μυχὸν Mr, σὸν οἶκον FVN; 217 μόρσιμοι Mr, μόρσιμοι$^{\text{ος}}$ FV, μόρσιμος N; 431 παρόντοιν...λόγου Mr, παρόντων...λόγος FVN; 438 σέβουσαι Mr, σέβ$^{\text{οι}}$ομαι$^{\text{εν}}$ FVN and a few others less important) might have arisen in some later copy of M and not in the archetype. One variation perhaps, 275 ἐπωπᾷ φρενί Mr, ἐποπτᾷ τῇ φρενί FVN, is of archetypal origin. It is rather curious that FVN have twice in this play preserved a small lacuna occurring in their original: 245 μηνυτῆρος Mr, μηνυτη ... FV, μηνυτῆσιν N; 570 διάτορος Τυρσηνικὴ Mr, διάκτορος ..... Τυρσηνικὴ V, and so F with marginal note πέλει, διάκτορος πέλει N.

The evidence of the Eumenides thus harmonizes with that of the Agamemnon. And I find that, if I adhere to the rules which I laid down at the beginning of this paper, I am compelled to reject the ordinary theory. There are many passages where the reading of FVN can be explained as a perversion of that of M. But of these passages there is none, perhaps by their very nature there cannot be any one, that compels us to

assume such an hypothesis to explain it. Rather they stand as it were *ἐν μεταιχμίῳ*, and our decision depends not at all on such passages as these, but entirely upon passages of a different character, if such are to be found. Since then in certain passages the codices M and B present differences from the group FVN and from each other, which differences can only be explained as arising from original uncial writing or from some original double reading, we can only regard them as different offshoots of one root, a conclusion further confirmed by the independent standing of B and of FVN in other passages where they differ from M as compared with the manner in which the remaining copies differ from that codex.

As for these remaining manuscripts my silence may perhaps suffice to indicate my assent to the ordinary theory. It is certainly quite unnecessary for me to do again what has been so often done, even if it has been accomplished by a too frequent use of 'facile' 'non difficile' and 'dilucide apparet.' One however of these later manuscripts, the codex Robortelli, seems, if certain peculiarities in Robortello's text are to be taken as representing its reading, though certainly copied from M, to have contained variants due to some different tradition. Thus the following errors are explicable only by uncial confusion; Ag. 147 *ὅλτων*, 231 *ταντότολμον*, Eum. 46 *προέθεν*, 920 *νέμοι*, 949 *τίσι*; while in Ag. 1111 if Dindorf's *καιρία* be correct, then the *καὶ διρία* of R is to be explained only on the hypothesis of dittography and uncial confusion. Certain other of the more recent manuscripts offer now and then curious readings, witness the following of the codex Augustanus, Eum. 763 *ὁ καὶ*, 773 *Ἀμηχάνοις παρέξομεν*, 910 *εὐστενοῦντας* (*εὐθενοῦντας* Mr, *εὐστενοῦντα* FVN), which I owe to a collation of that manuscript with Stanley's text in the handwriting of Godfrey Hermann. But I find nothing to show that any one of these later manuscripts is to be elevated to a position equal to that of M, and acquiesce in the opinion that they are copies of that codex, with some admixture from the other two classes.

In the Prometheus, Seven against Thebes, and Persae the evidence is, as I said before, scantily reported. Hermann, while giving numerous variants from the worthless later manuscripts,

has cited B very seldom, and of the third class only V. If therefore we were to limit ourselves to these three plays, we should find very little reason for quarrelling with the accepted opinion; and it is no wonder that Martin Sorof (de ratione, quae inter eos codices recentiores, quibus Aeschyli fabulae Prometheus, Septem adv. Thebas, Persae continentur, et codicem Laurentianum intercedat. Berlin 1882) should, on this evidence alone, come to the conclusion '1. omnes codices recentiores, quibus Prom. VII. Pers. continentur, ex uno codice A manasse, 2. codicem A ex cod. Laur. descriptum esse, 3. neque in codice A, qui quas singulis locis scripturas exhibuerit e consensu codicum recentiorum videri liceat, neque in his ipsis ulla antiquioris recensionis praeter eam, quae in cod. Laur. exstat, vestigia inesse, sed quaecumque in eis aliter atque in cod. Laur. exarata sint ad Byzantinos grammaticos referenda esse.' But now that we have, by consideration of those plays where the evidence is more definite and more fully reported, arrived at conclusions different from these, the few readings of B and V recorded in the three plays may be interpreted in the light of those results, and the vast mass of later variants may be left to Sorof and his fellows to deal with as they please. There are certain discrepancies between M and VB which point to the uncials of the archetype: Theb. 122 *πολύν* M, *πολύ* V; 61 *πλευμόνων* M, *πνευμόνων* BV and the later manuscripts except five which have *πνευμάτων*; 402 *ὁμαίμων* M, *ὁ δαίμων* BVr, this latter reading being written above the line in M by a hand of the fourteenth century, which must have got it from some one of the later manuscripts; Pers. 45 *δίοποι* M, *δίοπτοι* BVR; 540 *ἀπαλαῖς* M, *ἀταλαῖς* V. In Pers. 583 *ἔρανται δαιμόνια*, which all other manuscripts give for the *ἐραδαιμόνια* of M, cannot possibly have arisen from the latter; on the contrary the word *ἔρανται* might easily have been mutilated in such a concursus of similar letters as *ἔρᾱταιδαιμόνια*. Pers. 909 *δαμασθέντες* of V for *δμαθέντες* of M may be 'correction,' may equally well be owing to dittography and uncial confusion. But perhaps the most striking instance in these plays is that of the verse Theb. 177 b. omitted by M but given by all the other manuscripts. Of this Weil says (pref. to

Teubner's edition pp. v, vi): 'primum quidem facile versus omitti poterat a libri Medicei scriptore inter versum 194 (177 Wecklein), quo finitur in illo codice folium 66[b], et versum 196, a quo incipit folium 67[a]. At eum quem reliqui libri praebent versum absurdum esse ait Dindorf. Vereor ne cupidius vir summus quam verius iudicaverit. Posse illum versum abesse non infitior, sed tamen nihil habet reprehensione dignum, immo increpationem mulierum apte claudit et absolvit. Cf. Suppl. 407—417 (412—422). Verum absurdus esse eo nomine dicitur quod orationis hiatum non explet. Audio, sed hanc ipsam ob causam eum genuinum esse statuo. Quid enim moveret commenticium illum grammaticum ut versum de suo adderet nisi quod intellegeret nonnulla deesse ad sententiarum nexum? Tum autem interpolaturus erat quae qualicunque modo lacunam illam expleret, non quae salva sententia omitti poterant. Itaque si das orationem hiare recepto versu illo etiam alterum desiderari statuendum erit. At illud ipsum non concedo. Quid iubeat Eteocles, quid vetet, quum satis declarent verba *ἔνδον δ' οὖσα μὴ βλάβην τίθει*, ad rem nihil desideratur; in forma orationis offendi potest, nam particulae copulativae, qua annectuntur verba *κεἰ μή τις ἀρχῆς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀκούσεται*, vix locum esse dixeris ubi ab increpatione ad minas transitus fit. Attamen nescio an latius pateat coniunctionis *καί* usus apud Aeschylum antiquae simplicitatis sectatorem. Cf. Agam. v. 1239 (1238), Suppl. 443 (452), 957 (968), 983 (994).' Thus far Weil, to whose statement of the case I have nothing to add. He well compares the similar instance of Sophocles, Tyrannus 800. Even Wecklein in 1872 (Studien zu Aeschylus p. 61), though regarding the verse as an interpolation, did not attribute it to a later period than that of M, but confessed 'müssen wir annehmen, dass auch jener V. (i.e. 177[b]) am Rande (i.e. of the archetype) gestanden und desshalb von dem sonst so sorgfältigen Schreiber des Med. übersehen worden sei.' But he has since changed his opinion[1]. There are certain other curiosities in

[1] I take the opportunity to remark in passing that the illusiveness of the evidence recorded in these three plays is well shown by the fact that Wecklein, on the same page, expresses the opinion that only in the Prom. Pers. and Septem have we manuscript authority independent of M, though

these three tragedies which are deserving of notice. Thus in Theb. 83 V and certain later manuscripts preserve the true reading ὠτὶ which M has lost, and which can hardly be attributed to the happy conjecture of some Byzantine scribe: in fact the archetype seems here to have had ᶜοτι, that is, ᵒ̀ωτὶ, whence the πεδιοπλοκτύπος τί of M: again in 91 θεαινᾶν of V and certain *recc.* is a most unlikely error or conjecture for θεᾶν of M. It would be interesting to know whether the puzzling variant φύλῳ in 171, puzzling if regarded as a later conjecture for γένει, quoted by Hermann only from some later copies, is to be found in FVN or B. That B and several later manuscripts in v. 381 offer ὁρμαίνων μένει for the ὁρμαίνει μένων of M is the ground for Frey's opinion (de Aeschyli Scholiis Mediceis 1857, p. 8) that the reading is a false one owing to a variant in the preceding line κατασθμαίνων μένει. Again in v. 906 πάρα δ' of V for πάρεστιν δ' of M can, I think, be with more justice attributed to some older tradition than to the hand of some Byzantine bungler. The following readings from the Persae, if not decisive, are at least enough to give us pause before we subscribe to the current opinion: 140 αἰχμάεντα M, εὐναιάεντα V; 220 τελεῖν M, λαβεῖν B; 226 κάτοχος for κάτοχ' V; 260 λυπηρὰ λυπηρὰ added in B; 339 συμβολαῖς V for ἐμβολαῖς; 421 ἑστιοῦτο V for ὑπτιοῦτο; 444 φύσιν M, φύσει V (perhaps owing to the uncial ϕγcι, cf. Agam. 6); 534 γένηται V for πρόσθηται; 539 στυγερῷ B for δνοφερῷ; 689 ῥοθιάζοντες M, ὀρθρίζοντες V; 715 χρόνῳ M, λόγῳ B; also the following curious omissions which are perhaps owing to later mutilation of the archetype: 68 γείτονα χώραν omitted by V; 102 φυγεῖν by V; 160 καὶ by V and B; 232 γῆς by B; 449 δέ by B; 641 διαβοάσω by V; 643 μοι by V; 648 δ' by V; 926 φῶτες by B; 931 γαίας by B.

The character of Robortello's manuscript is shown by the following facts: Theb. 50 it and three other later copies give χεροῖν for χερσίν, an evident uncial error, cf. Agam. 147; in v.

derived from the same original. Compare this with the conclusions arrived at by Sorof from consideration of merely the same evidence!

61 it agrees with V and B in another uncial variant *πνευμόνων* for *πλευμόνων*; 75 with six of the later manuscripts it gives *ζευγλῇσι δουλειῇσι* for *ζυγοῖσι δουλείοισι* of M; in 84 for *τε χρίμπτεται* it offers *τ' ἐγχρίμπτεται*; in 91 it agrees with the reading of V, *θεαινᾶν*; it contains the verse 177[b] thus *τοιαῦτ' ἂν γυναιξὶ συνναίων ἔχοις*; in 232 it gives another uncial error *ἄταν* for *ἄγαν*; in 380 it has *κατασθμαίνει μένων* thus adding additional confirmation to Frey's theory; 402 it reads *ὁ δαίμων*. In the Persae it agrees with B and V in the reading *δίοπτοι* in v. 45; 68 it gives *χθόνα* for *χώραν* and the converse in v. 75, followed in both cases by G; 101 for *ὑπὲρ θυατὸν* it offers *ὕπερθεν*; 160 it agrees with V and B in the omission of *καὶ*; 260 with B in the double addition of *λυπηρὰ*; in 449 where B omits the *δέ*, R places it before *μόρῳ*; in 641 it agrees with V in the omission of *διαβοάσω* and in the omission of *μοι* in 643, as in that of *δ'* in 648. In common with B it has a few curious transpositions, viz. 255 *τὸ δὲ περσῶν*, 500 *στρυμόνος ἁγνοῦ*, 768 *ἤνυσεν ἔργον*. On the contrary it agrees with M against all the other copies in the reading *τόπῳ* for *πάγῳ* in Prom. 20, and in verse 1039 it stands alone in the reading *τέγγῃ γὰρ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ μαλθάσσῃ κέαρ λίταις*. Its 'mixed' character is thus clearly seen, and it becomes matter for wonder that Dindorf and others should persist in the belief that the manuscript used by Robortello was no other than M itself. The mixed character of the other copies is shown by their agreement now with M against the other two classes, now with these latter against M. Cf. Theb. 50, 61, 75, 83, 91, 171, 177[b], 381, 402, Pers. 68, 75, 583.

Thus far are we led by a consideration of the differences in reading between the various manuscripts. I have been anxious to state the case fairly and to allow the supporters of the theory of Burges as much as could in reason be allowed them. And after this examination I cannot but think that that theory is untrue, and that the one which I have put forward accounts at any rate better for the facts. I must also say that the method by which the critics uphold the idea that the Mediceus is the source of all other existing manuscripts seems to me to be a most illusive and at the same time a most unsafe one to

build any textual criticism upon. Once we assume the existence of so-called 'correctors' capable of introducing such extraordinary variants into our manuscripts as those in Ag. 143, 1131, Eum. 54, Pers. 583, Theb. 177^{b}, etc. there is no knowing where we are to stop: the Mediceus itself may equally well have come into the hands of such critics, and may represent its archetype with as bad faith as, by the theory, F and B represent it. Such a theory, then, cuts the ground from under our feet and leaves us without any firm standpoint for criticism.

This however savours somewhat of abusing the plaintiff's counsel. It will be much better to hasten to give further proof of my theory.

§ 2.

Karl Lachmann, in the most brilliant demonstration that I know of the relations between the manuscripts of any author, has in no small degree strengthened his theory and made the said relations clearer, by showing, from certain indications in the existing manuscripts, the number of pages and of lines in each page of the lost archetype, and by proving that certain omissions found in one class of the manuscripts could only be owing to mutilation of the archetype taking place at a date posterior to that at which the other class of manuscripts was copied from the original. Lest any stubborn defender of the theory of Burges should accuse me of having attacked him and his fellows on very slender grounds, I propose here to do for the manuscripts of Aeschylus what Lachmann did for those of Lucretius. Before setting out on this investigation I shall make two assumptions, that the tragedies followed the same order in the archetype as they do in the Mediceus, viz., Persae, Agamemnon, Choephori, Prometheus, Eumenides, Seven against Thebes, Supplices, and that in each tragedy in the Mediceus the number of lines of the same tragedy in the archetype were preserved, whether those lines consist of one verse or of more than one.

My starting point is verse 123 of the Choephori, found in the manuscripts after 164 and transferred by Hermann to its present place. Of the correctness of this transposition there cannot, at least in my opinion, be any doubt; it remains only to explain how the error took place. Verse 124 has lost its first three syllables, an accident which was likely to happen at the top or at the bottom of a left-hand page. Assuming that it was at the former we find that 123 should have been written at the bottom of the preceding right-hand page. Now if the leaf forming these two pages was somewhat shorter than the others, and if the scribe, as was natural while it lay on the leaf below, did not notice this fact but calmly continued writing to the end of his page, verse 123 would then, instead of being written at the foot of the recto of the short leaf, have been written in the corresponding position on the next leaf; and, since it is in the Mediceus the forty-second verse from its correct position, the pages must have contained each of them twenty-one verses, the scribe having squeezed that normal number into the verso of the short leaf and having written twenty, besides v. 123, on the following page.

Let us now make another assumption, that the manuscript in which all this happened was the archetype, and then, with these data, that each page contained twenty-one verses and that v. 123 of the Choephori was the last of a right-hand page, let us restore the paging of that manuscript as far as we find it possible to do so. Working backwards from our starting point we find that verse 20 of the Choephori was the first of a right-hand page, for verse 123 was the last of such a page and 123 divided by 21 gives us 5 with a remainder of 18. We must now leave the opening of the Choephori and seek for some fixed point in the Agamemnon. This I find in the lacuna (noted by Hermann) of four anapaestic dimeters after verse 1458. I may say in passing that it is not for the convenience with which it fits into my scheme of pages of the archetype that I believe we must here mark a lacuna, but for the fact that the antistrophic responsion becomes thus simpler: and I may also remark that the repetition of the ephymnia throughout this *κόμμος* involves assumptions

at least as questionable as that of a loss of four verses in this place. This lacuna then marks for us the foot of a right-hand page, the opening verse of which was 1444. But now another question arises. The Mediceus has preserved for us only 415 lines (i.e. of the archetype, for the number of verses is considerably more), how are we then to proceed with our calculation? My suggestion is, that the Florentinus has preserved the lost number of lines, its *κωλομετρία* here coinciding with the *στιχομετρία* of the archetype. That this is more than probable I am prepared to show. Between verses 322 and 1051 the Mediceus has lost a whole quire of sixteen pages. Of the following quire four pages have been preserved, containing each of them 47 lines. Now supposing that each page of the lost quire contained 47 verses then the number of lines lost would be 752. But the number of lines in a page of the Mediceus is not a fixed quantity. Thus of the quire preceding the missing one the first, second, third, fourth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, thirteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth pages contain each of them forty-three verses, the fifth forty-two, the sixth, eleventh and fourteenth forty-four, and the twelfth forty-five. And in the missing quire it is not unlikely that the numbers so varied as to make up the sum of 756 lines, which is the number of *κῶλα* preserved by the Florentinus between verses 322 and 1051. Our assumption then, that the Mediceus and Florentinus have between them preserved the *στιχομετρία* of the archetype, receives here some slight justification.

Verse 1458 was the seventeenth of a right-hand page. From 1158, where the Mediceus for the second time deserts us it is the three-hundredth verse in the Florentinus. Verses 1051 to 1158 are in the Mediceus 94 verses: then follow the 756 verses preserved by the Florentinus up to v. 323, from which in the Mediceus v. 6 is the three-hundred-and-sixteenth. Adding together 316, 756, 94, 300, and 4 (this being the number of verses lost after 1458) we obtain 1470, which being divided by 21 gives us 70, that is from verse 6 to verse 1458 of the Agamemnon are 70 pages. 1458 was on a right-hand page, consequently 6 was the first of a left-hand page. On the

preceding page were the first five lines of the Agamemnon, preceded by the three lines

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ

θεράπων ἀγαμέμνονος ὁ προλογιζόμενος, οὐχὶ ὁ ὑπὸ αἰγίσθου ταχθείς,
φύλαξ

so given in the Mediceus. Above this heading came a blank line, then the subscription αἰσχύλου πέρσαι (so M) and the last eleven verses of the Persae. That play contains 1075 lines, the subtraction of 11 leaves us 1064. This number divided by 21 gives us 50 with a remainder of 14, that is, the Persae began on the fifty-first page from that on which the Agamemnon opened. Now the Agamemnon began on the seventy-first page from that which ended with 1458 and the four verses thereafter lost; consequently verse 1458 of the Agamemnon came on the hundred-and-twenty-second page from that on which the Persae opened. But as the former was a right-hand page the latter must have been a left-hand one, that is, the Persae began on the second page of the archetype, the first according to custom having been left vacant. The seven lines preceding the first verse of the Persae were occupied by the argument; from page 3 onwards the head-lines ran as follows: Pers. 15, 36, 57, 78, 99, 120, 143, 164, 185, 206, 227, 248, 269, 290, 311, 332, 353, 374, 395, 416, 437, 458, 479, 500, 521, 542, 563, 585, 606, 627, 648, 669, 690, 711, 732, 753, 774, 795, 816, 837, 858, 879, 900, 921, 942, 963, 981 (this verse is lost, evidently owing to its position in the archetype), 1005, 1025, 1046, 1067, Agam. 6, 27, 48, 69, 90, 111, 133, 154, 175, 196, 217, 238, 259, 280, 301, 322, 343, 364, 384, 404, 421, 440, 462, 483, 502, 523, 544, 565, 586, 607, 628, 649, 670, 691, 710, 730, 749, 765, 783, 804, 825, 846, 867, 888, 909, 930, 951, 971, 991, 1009, 1029, 1050, 1071, 1092, 1117, 1147, 1169, 1190, 1211, 1232, 1253, 1274, 1295, 1316, 1337, 1358, 1379, 1400, 1422, 1444. This brings us to p. 123, ending with v. 1458, after which the Florentinus has preserved 217 verses, that is eleven pages minus fourteen verses. This brings the Agamemnon down to line 7 of page 134. Now will the long-suffering reader allow me to make another little assump-

tion? This one is quite unessential to the matter in hand, therefore I may perhaps be permitted to make it. Hermann marked a lacuna of two verses after 1553. Now it is not more licentious to suppose that they were originally in the archetype and the Mediceus, and omitted through carelessness in that manuscript from which FVN were copied, than to suppose their loss at all. If then we add these two verses, 1664 comes at the foot of the right-hand page 133, which will sufficiently account for its mutilation, and the headlines of the eleven pages run thus: 1459, 1480, 1500, 1521, 1542, 1559, 1581, 1602, 1623, 1644, 1665.

We saw that v. 19 of the Choephori was the last of a left-hand page. This must have been p. 136, for on p. 134 were at least seven verses of the Agamemnon. But, since 42 verses are required to fill pages 135 and 136, and since for that purpose we have but 19 verses of the Choephori, we must conclude that considerably more than nine verses have been lost from the prologue of that play, as Paley saw, comparing those of the Agamemnon and Eumenides. This conjecture is supported by another consideration. Between Agam. 1158 and Cho. 10 the Mediceus has lost twelve pages and the Florentinus has preserved 517 verses. These 517 verses are exactly eleven pages of 47 verses each, leaving the twelfth page to be accounted for. This probably contained the missing portion of the prologue and perhaps also an argument, which in the archetype may have filled up the rest of p. 134. From p. 136 the pages run as follows: p. 137, vv. 20—40; p. 138, vv. 41—61; p. 139, vv. 62—81; p. 140, vv. 82—102; p. 141, vv. 103—122. Thus verse 123 should have been at the foot of p. 141, but was in reality written at the foot of p. 143. From this latter place to the end there are 915 lines, that is, 44 pages minus nine verses. The Choephori ended then with the twelfth line of p. 187, the headlines from p. 141 onward running thus: 124 (mutilated owing to its position), 145, 165, 186, 206, 227, 248, 269, 290, 311, 332, 353, 374, 394, 415, 436, 457, 479, 499, 520, 541, 562, 583, 604, 625, 645, 665, 686, 707, 728, 749, 770, 791, 812, 833, 855, 876, 896, 917, 938, 958, 979, 1000, 1021, 1042, 1063.

The remainder of p. 187 was taken up by the subscription

of the Choephori and the argument of the Prometheus. This play, containing 1087 lines or 52 pages minus 5 verses, began with the first line of p. 188 and ended with the sixteenth of p. 239, the headlines running thus: 1, 22, 43, 64, 85, 106, 127, 148, 169, 190, 209, 230, 251, 272, 293, 314, 335, 356, 377, 398, 419, 440, 461, 482, 503, 524, 547, 582, 606, 631, 653, 674, 695, 717, 738, 759, 780, 801, 822, 843, 864, 885, 906, 934, 956, 977, 998, 1019, 1040, 1061, 1085, 1112. This play offers no indications in the way of lacunae or mutilated verses, but the Eumenides, which follows, suffered mutilation in the archetype in a way which has most important bearings on my theory of the manuscript relations. The argument of this play followed the Prometheus on p. 239, the first line of p. 240 was the title

+ αἶcχýλογ 'εγμενíδεc +

as it is written in the Mediceus. To verse 584, *ὅπως ἐπίστῳ τήνδε κύρωσον δίκην*, there are, including the title, 504 lines; the double *μυγμός* and *ὠγμός* of vv. 117, 120, 123 and 126 not being written in separate lines but prefixed to the following distich, while the *μυγμὸς διπλοῦς ὀξύς* of v. 129 formed one line with the following *λαβὲ λαβὲ λαβὲ λαβέ, φράζου*. But 504 lines are exactly 24 pages of 21 lines each, consequently v. 584 is the last of p. 263. The following 63 verses 585—647, that is, three pages of the archetype, are missing in the three manuscripts FVN. This points to loss of those three pages at a period posterior to the writing of the Mediceus, anterior to that of the manuscript from which FVN were copied. But how was it that only three pages of writing were lost? The only explanation is that the fourth was blank. When the scribe came to the foot of p. 263 he turned over two leaves at once, and thus it came to pass that vv. 585—605 were written on p. 266, vv. 606—626 on p. 267, vv. 627—647 on p. 268, while pp. 264 and 265 were left vacant. How the leaves were lost, though unessential, is perhaps 'not beyond all conjecture.' It may be that some later scribe, perceiving the error of the former one, cut out the hundred-and-thirty-third leaf, with the intention of writing on p. 264 the verses which had wrongly been written on p. 266, and through accident (these scribes, as

we all know, were a very dull lot!) cut out the hundred-and-thirty-fourth as well. He then put the two loose leaves back into the book, forgot all about them, and thus they were lost. When the next scribe came to copy that manuscript from which FVN are derived, the verses were not to be found. Happily for us the Mediceus had long been written.

The Eumenides contained altogether 914 lines, of which the first 504 were written, as we saw, on pages 240—263: the remaining 410 require 20 pages less 10 verses, and as the first of these pages was p. 266, the play finished with the eleventh verse of p. 265. The headlines ran thus throughout the whole play: title, 21, 42, 63, 84, 105, 131, 152, 182, 203, 224, 245, 268, 289, 311, 338, 372, 403, 424, 445, 466, 487, 522, 562, 585, 606, 627, 648, 668 (667 b having been lost at the foot of the preceding page), 689, 710, 731, 752, 773, 800, 827, 851, 872, 895, 916, 947, 977, 1009, 1034. Page 286 began with the heading

ὑπόθεcιc τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ θήβας,

which was followed by the short argument in four lines and the list of dramatis personae in three lines as given by the Medicean. With these eight lines added the play contains 930 lines, that is 45 pages less 15 lines, so that the play ran to the sixth verse of p. 330. To v. 204 there are 189 lines so that the said verse came at the foot of p. 294, where I believe that it suffered mutilation. I would, in order to supply *ἐκλείπειν* with an object, write *ἀλλ' οὖν θεοὺς ἀδύτους ἁλούσης πόλεος ἐκλείπειν λόγος*. The cause of the ordinary reading is clear: the first three letters were torn away, then some corrector, taking τογc for the article and perhaps with a reminiscence of Agam. 351, wrote *τῆς* overhead. The headlines in this play run as follows: title, 14, 35, 56, 77, 98, 121, 154, 179, 205, 226, 247, 268, 303, 334, 360, 381, 402, 423, 444, 465, 486, 507, 528, 549, 570, 591, 612, 633, 654, 675, 696, 717, 741, 777, 798, 825, 853 (874 b has been lost at the foot of this page), 875, 906, 941, 987, 1012, 1033, 1061. Whether the argument of the Supplices was written on the remaining part of p. 330 or not, I do not know: p. 331 began with the title thus given in the Mediceus: ικ ετ-ιδες ἀ-ιc . χ̓ λογ· which, with the 892 lines of the play,

makes 893 lines, or 44 pages minus ten verses; hence the Supplices ended with verse 11 of page 373, the headlines running thus: title, 29, 59, 98, 135, 173, 198, 219, 240, 261, 282, 303, 324, 345, 369, 390, 411, 440, 464, 485, 506, 527, 548, 571, 592, 613, 634, 666, 708, 734, 755, 777, 802, 842, 882, 912, 934, 955, 976, 1001, 1022, 1049, 1074. One verse in this play has suffered mutilation owing to its position, that is v. 368 standing at the foot of p. 244. The unusually extensive corruption extending through the scene between the maidens and the herald is perhaps owing to the fact that pages 364 and 365, on which the greater part of that scene stood, adhered to one another on account of moisture or some similar cause. Page 374, the last of the manuscript, was, like the first, vacant.

The reader is now probably weary of much calculation, and so am I. I do not venture to consider the above reckoning as in every particular correct—indeed I am only too conscious of its many unsure points—still I do think that in the main it is right, and that it has helped to make the principal point, namely that FVN are derived from a copy of the archetype later than M, fixed and certain. To my knowledge only one preceding critic has ventured on the task of demonstrating the number of pages in the archetype, Rudolf Merkel in his 'Aeschyli cod. Laurentiani Oxoniae typis expressi praefationis lineamenta' Dec. 1870, but his results are uncertain and reached by dubious methods. In his copy of the Oxford reprint—a book which, by the way, was of great help to me in my calculation—now in my possession, exist still the notes of his reckoning, which however, as I have no desire to ruin my eyesight by endeavouring to read cramped German handwriting, I have not given myself the trouble to decipher.

It may not be amiss at the end of this inquiry to sum up the results shortly. They are as follows: At some time during the tenth century there was brought to Byzantium a manuscript, written in uncial letters, and containing the seven tragedies of Aeschylus in the following order: Persae, Agamemnon, Choephori, Prometheus, Eumenides, Septem adversus Thebas, Supplices. The manuscript consisted of 374 pages, of which

the first and last according to custom, the 264th and 265th owing to accident, were left blank, the remaining pages containing each twenty-one verses. Of this manuscript two copies were made, of neither of which the priority can be determined: one of these now exists in the Laurentian library at Florence, desk XXXII, MS 9, of the other a copy survives in the library of S. Mark at Venice, desk XCI, MS 4. At a later time leaves 133 and 134 of the archetype were lost, with the result that in a copy made after that loss, verses 585—647 of the Eumenides were missing. This copy no longer survives, but three manuscripts derived from it are still in existence, one in the Laurentian library, desk XXXI, MS 8, another in the library of S. Mark, XCI. 5, the third in the Farnese library at Naples, I. E. 5, in all of which the said verses are wanting. Of these the last manuscript has been throughout most audaciously corrected and interpolated. The later manuscripts are copied either from any one of these three sources (mostly from the Mediceus) or from them all together, as in the case of the later copies of the Persae, Prometheus, and Seven against Thebes. The manuscript used by Robortello for his edition of 1552, now lost, was a copy of the Mediceus but contained annotations from some source which I am unable to determine.

The story of the bringing of the Mediceus to Italy is well known. With regard to the codex Bessarionis, I would hazard the guess that it was brought over from Greece by that same Aurispa to whom Niccolò Niccoli owed the Mediceus; for Dindorf says (note to p. v of Teubner's edition): 'De Ioanne Aurispa Siculo comparanda Ambrosii ad eum epistola, in qua Ambrosius *libros sacros ex Byzantino in Siciliam ab Aurispa transmissos* memorat. Maioris momenti Aurispae ipsius ad Ambrosium epistola est, in qua scriptorum profanorum volumina ex Graecia allata Venetiis se habere scribit ducenta et duo de quadraginta...Quorum librorum pars aliqua inter eos esse videtur qui nunc in Bibliotheca Marciana servantur, inscripto "*κτῆμα Βησσαρίωνος*."'

Tantum est. Whether the theory here set forth be true or not, and if it is true, whether it be of much use or not for the restoration of the text of Aeschylus, I now give others the

opportunity to decide. In any case the *codex Mediceus* remains our first authority, and the number of passages in which the other families of MSS are of use in determining the reading is by no means nearly so great as those in which we could depend upon the former alone. Still a few such passages have been pointed out above, others are easily to be found, and I am conscious of a belief, and perhaps also of a wrong-headed kind of hope, that a better collation of the other families will bring many more such to light. I must also point out certain passages wherein the reading of the second hand in M agrees with that of the first hand in the other manuscripts, and where the practical result of this theory would be to keep us from following the first hand of M as if it were, if not the whole truth, at least as much of it as we could get. I will give one instance. In Theb. 302 M has by the first hand *κατὰ ῥίψοπλον ἅταν ἐμβαλόντες*, by the second *καὶ τὰν* κτλ., in agreement with all other manuscripts, including B and V. Dr Verrall follows the first hand, saying 'The preposition is adverbial and constructed with *ἐμβαλόντες*, *quasi κατεμβαλόντες*.' I do not venture to say that this is incorrect, but I would point out that the consensus of all the manuscripts would seem to indicate *καὶ τὰν* as the archetypal reading, and that KATA is a very easy error for KAITĀ.

But the matter is now off my hands, and it is probable that I shall not again return to it. It is now for others to decide concerning the truth and value of my theory; it cost me no small amount of time and labour, balanced by the interest we all find in solving a difficult problem and—why should I not confess it?—the vain pleasure arising from the (perhaps deceptive) consciousness of having been the first to find the truth where many had sought it.

CHR. BRENNAN.

PROPERT. IV. 3. 35—38.

Et disco qua parte fluat uincendus Araxes
Quot sine aqua Parthus milia currat ecus.
Cogor et e tabula pictos ediscere mundos
Qualis et †haec docti sit positura dei.

Hoeufft conj. *Dahae* for *dei*. Rightly, I think, as regards the people meant, the Scythian Dahae, Vergil's *Indomitique Dahae* (Aen. VIII. 728). Mela I. 1. 13 *Dahae super Scythas Scytharumque deserta.* ib. III. 5 § 42 (Oxos) *iuxta Dahas primum inflectitur cursuque ad septentrionem conuerso inter Amardos et Paesicas os aperit.* This people is identified by a writer in the Dict. Geog. with the *Dai* of Herodotus I. 125, and this form of the gen. singular I suppose to have been written by the poet.

Then *haec docti* will be *educti*, the *elevated* Daan: a good word to describe the northern heights of Scythia, and perfectly illustrated by Vergil's (G. I. 240, 1)

Mundus ut ad Scythiam Rhipaeasque arduus arces
Consurgit, premitur Libyae devexus ad Austros.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ENNIUS ANN. 307—310.

Scitus, secunda loquens in tempore, commodus, uerbum
Paucum, multa tenens antiqua sepulta uetustas
†Quae facit et mores ueteresque nouosque tenentem
Multorum ueterum leges diuumque hominumque.

Among the conjectures proposed to remove the difficulty of this passage, I do not find any suggestion that *tenentem* may be an error for *tenentum*. If this was so, *Quae* might be retained as accus. plural, depending on *feceit*, which I elicit from the *facit et* of the MSS. of Gellius. The construction would be *tenens multa antiqua sepulta quae feceit uetustas tenentum mores ueteresque nouosque*, 'a store-house of much that was old and forgotten, of things done by an older generation of men who observed the customs of the past equally with those of newer times.' *Multorum ueterum leges* seems to be a further expansion of *mores ueteresque nouosque*, not only customs, but laws which went back to immemorial antiquity and in some cases were alleged to be instituted by the Gods themselves.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

SCALIGER'S UNPUBLISHED EMENDATIONS IN NONIUS (*continued*).

P. 267 32 (*colligere*) "*Confligere N.*" So Mercier in a manuscript note in his first edition; *f. confligere,* and in the printed text of his second.

274 19 (*convertere*) "*Convenire N.*" He adds "'(*convenire*) *et*', *v.c. Scaligeri.*" (See Müller's *apparatus.*)

278 18 "*Demere, demam, demere, demitur N.*" '*Demam*' *recte libri Plauti* says Müller.

279 4 (*persuade*) "*Pervade N.*" So Müller.

"(*Haud*) *transeas*" *N.*

280 2 (*Caecilius*) "*Caelius, Sc.*" So Mercier in his second edition.

280 36 (*in id*) "*Init. N.*" So *MS ap. Barth.,* Quicherat.

282 2 (*domina*) "*Dominia S.*"

284 16 (*rationem paret*) "*Ratio rem valet N.*"

286 28, 29 (*existimatio nomen*) "*N. existimationem meam.*"

(*referat*) "*Referant N.*"

300 13 (*cedere*) "*Cadere N*": so Mercier in manuscript note to ed. 1, and in the printed text of ed. 2. Quicherat and Müller follow.

300 32 (*quin totam purges, debelles me atque deuras*) "*Quin te tu purges, detergas, meque deuras N.*"

301 9 (*nervos omnes eligat*) "*Nervos eliget omnes N.*"

302 7 (*item*) "*Ignis N.*" So Brisson ap. Quich.

307 14 (*ut queam*) "*Ut non queam S.*" *At si,* a late emendation of his, is not in these notes.

321 31 (*audi*) "*Audio S.*"

322 7 (*ibis*) "*Civis S.*" *Civis* also Delbene, in a MS note

quoted by Quicherat: Mercier in a manuscript note to his first edition, and in the notes, but not the text, of his second.

325 6 (*cum isti ilico, id est in eum locum*) "*Cum isti* (*id est ivisti*) *ilico. Ilico, id est in eo loco. Naevius. N.*" ('*Ilico, in eo loco,' ita scripsi, quum libri haberent 'in eo loco,*' Mercier in ed. 2.)

325 32 (*Sallustius Iugurtha*) "*Sic lego, Sallust. Iugurtha, ubi.*"

332 43 (*sermonem satus*) "*Sermonem eius, Sc.*" ("*Lego 'sermones eius.'*" Mercier in margin of first edition: *in Plauto melius 'sermonem eius'* in the note in his second.)

333 1 (*hoc et*) "*Hinc et, Sc.*" ('*Hinc' conj. vir doctus in margine Iunii: quod ipse scripseram,* Quicherat.)

335 33 (*Sallust. Catil. lib. I.*) "*L. Cicero in Cat. primo, N.*" (So Mercier in a manuscript note to his first edition, and the text of his second.)

336 28 "*S lacte.*" So in his *Conjectanea* p. 158: Mercier in the margin of his first edition writes *ĩσ. lacte*, and *scribe 'lacte'* in the notes to his second.

339 24 (*et*) "*Te S.*" (So afterwards Passerat.)

340 25 (*virtutis haec tuae artis*). "*S; haec virtutis tuae atque artis.*" (So Corpet and Müller.)

342 17 (*maneas ad his* etc.) "*An 'abeas ab his, An te exilio mactent Pelopis ex terminis:' S.S.S.*"

342 33 "*Iacite, S.*" So *Conjectanea* p. 87.

344 13 (*nescio quid non est hoc merum*) "*N. 'merum' hic forte pro 'mirum' positum, et sic emaculandus locus: 'Nescio. A. Quid? B. Non est hoc merum quod hic plorat.*"

344 33, 36 (*dum miles hibernas* etc.) "*S. S. S. Dum miles Ibera In terra aera meret tres ex aetate quasi annos.*" (*annos hic errat*) "*S. S. S. S. Annos hic terra iam plures miles Ibera Nobiscum meret.*" Both emendations appear in Mercier's second edition; the last also in Palmier's *Spicilegium* p. 167 (a. 1580).

347 31 (*sequatur*) "*Sectetur S.*"

352 29 (*cassam*) "*Caussam N.*"

353 35 "*N. N. Coaluerunt hic duo fragmenta Sallustii, perperamque meo quidem iudicio, sic disjungenda. 'Et iam ante Iugurthae filia Boccho nupserat: verum ea necessitudo.*'

Idem Catilina, 'Praeterea necessitudo, quae etiam timidos fortes facit.' Idem Iugurthae bello." (So Mercier in his second edition; Quicherat says from Nicolas Faber.)

355 18 (*fere*) "*F. ferro, N.*"

355 29 "*F. 'supersedeas agere, ut ne inmane' N. Tu, Dne Scriveri, judica.*" This must be Alexander Schryver, not Peter, who was born in 1575.

357 2 (*pueri*) "*S. puelli.*"

357 9 (*altais*) "*Achaeis S.*"

358 5 (*haec.....domive*). "*Et. te S.*" This is quoted by Quicherat as *scriptum in margine Iunii:* is it then possible that the Meermann volume got into the hands of some Parisian scholar? The emendation is also written on the margin of Mercier's first edition: in his second Mercier has *ac...domi te.*

358 9 (*non amatorem olim defensorem per eum volet*) "*Leg. 'nunc': 'rerum' vel 'Chaeream.'*" (*Nunc* Mercier in his second edition.)

361 25 "*Unam, S*": and so again in the *Catalecta.*

364 7 (*sed ut ipsi seu animum* etc.) "*Sed ut ipsi saeva nimium periclitantur, videant quid se putent esse facturos N.*"

365 17 (*regere*) "*F. tegere: N.*" (and so Lipsius).

369 41 (*putem*) "*Forte 'putent.'*"

370 16 (*Synaristosis. Heri* etc.) "*Hetaerista. Scis heri, Sc.*"

373 2 (*haec faciant*) "*Fort. 'ecfaciant.'*"

378 19 (*nunc sancta*) "*Samnita S.*"

378 23 (*premens*) "*Permensa S.*" (and so Columna, a. 1590.)

381 17 (*melior remis*) "*Ergo Nonius legit in Virgilio 'melior remus.' 'Remiges' Plautus vocat navales pedes.*"

382 13 (*humorem*) "'*Humore,' Delrio, Sc.*"

386 30 (*laeta viri*) "'*Laetavisti*' *omnino legendum est, quemadmodum adducitur supra*" (p. 132) "*in 'Laetare.'*" So afterwards Passerat (ap. Quich.) and Mercier in his second edition.

391 41 (*quanti*) "*Quanti N.*" Attributed to Gulielmus; but I cannot find it either in his *Verisimilia* or his *Plautinae Quaestiones.*

392 22 (*possunt*) "*Possum N.*" So Mercier in the MS notes to his first edition, from *V* (i.e. *vetus codex*), and in his second edition.

392 26 (*visum est mani mihi*) "*N. virum aestimavi mihi.*"

393 31 (*huc*) "*Huic N.*"

394 3 (*eum vires*) "*Cum viris N. Cum viro C*" (i.e. Cujas' MS). Quicherat quotes *cum viris* from Cujas.

397 41 (*hoc*) "*huc N.*" So Turnebus, and Guyet ap. Quich.

398 24 (*vatis*) "*F. votis.*" So Bongars, notes to Justin 24 5 (p. 60), and Mercier in his second edition.

398 33 (*habere, ulcisci*) "*habere atque ulcisci, Sc.*"

422 15 (*legatum*) "*F. levatum N.*" So Passerat ap. Quich., Mercier in the MS notes to his first edition and the text of his second.

423 5 (*in se veritatem*) "*F. incivilitatem N.*"

426 3 (*exoratus*) "*F. exortus N.*" So Mercier in his second edition.

427 5 (*citer*) "*Teter, Sc.,*" and so Passerat ap. Quicherat. But afterwards Scaliger conj. *icterus.*

430 2 (*unde sacrificantibus*) "*F. unde a sacrificantibus N.*"

434 9 (*profesto concelebras*) "*Profesto et festo concelebras, Sc.*"

434 13 (*tutum*) "*Tum ut, Sc.*"

438 7 (*annuere*) Scaliger would expunge the word.

445 7 (*heu mihi*) "*Hei mî N.*" *Ei* Mercier in MS note in his first edition, and in the text of his second.

445 9 (*Eurysacem*) "*Eurysace S.*" So Passerat ap. Quich.

447 23 "*Sc. 'sicco robore,' vel 'probrose.'*" *Sicco robore* is known.

449 19 (*animata* in Junius) "*Inanimata N. ut ex exemplis patet*": so Ald. before him.

450 24 "*Sc. Mallem 'cincinnis,' qua ratione etiam dixit 'calamistratam orationem.'*" *Cincinnos, cincinnis* Quicherat, from Cic. De Or. 3 § 100.

451 16 (*regi*) "*Lego, 'legi' N.*"

452 6 (*superficias*) "*Supercilia, Sc.*"

453 19 (*habent*) "'*Habebant' ex Sallustio legendum.*" So ed. 1470, and afterwards Quicherat.

455 13 (*tantum uti* Junius) "*Tanti viri N.*"

455 20 (*barba*) "*Barbato N.*": and so Passerat.

456 1 (*excorde*) "*Exporge S.*" *Malo 'exporge,'* Mercier in MS note to his first edition: and he adopts it in his second.

458 24 "*Quam sympathiam labia et oculi haberent, quid imaginum interesset puerum utrum e. d. is verus an μόνος ἔρως ac purus dum cogito S. S. S. S.*"

464 7 (*iactus*) "*Aestus N.*"

465 13 (*Claudius lib. xvi. Agni*) "*N. Annali.*" "*Lego xvi Annal.*" Mercier MS note to his first edition, and in the printed note in his second.

466 5 (*dolentis persona eos parentes cares*) "*Illud 'dolentis persona' interpretamentum Nonii est. Ego lego 'meos parentes careo.'*" So Mercier in his second edition.

467 22* (*alte*) "*F. alitem N.*"

467 36 (*viget, vagat*) "*Induco τὸ 'viget,' quoniam in v. l. non reperitur, nihilque ad sensum facit.*" So Mercier in his second edition.

467 31 (*Cadmi devagant*) "*Cadmides S.*" *Cadmeide* Mercier in MS note to his first edition, and in the text of his second.

467 29 "*N. Quid tandem ubi ea est? Quo se receptat* (for *quod recepta*) *exul. N. incerta vagat.*" *Fortasse "quo"* Mercier in MS note to his first edition, but not in the text of his second.

468 26 (*atque*) "*Utque, Sc.*" And so recently Müller.

469 20 (*et quam*) "*Aequam, Sc.*"; and so Fruterius and others.

469 23 (*ordine*) "*Ordina N.*"

472 20 (*te*) "*Sese, Sc.*"

473 7 (*neque*, etc. *cor*) "*Neque Cor tam ferum, Sc.*"

473 16 (*sine*) "*Sibi, Sc.*"

474 34 (*privem*) "*Iuvem N.*"

475 2 (*sit sed tamen*) "*Siet tamen N.*"

475 12 (*corrige*) "*Porrige N. Sic quoque edidit Delrio.*" Quicherat quotes several other scholars as having made this correction.

* This and the three following notes are printed in the order given by Junius.

475 15 (*O socii*) "*Nunc O socii S.*"; making an anapaestic line.

475 19 (*prologo*) "*Prologus, Sc.*"

475 35 (*ego praestolabo illi, eo citante opicium*) "*Ego praestolabo illic ut sit anted ostium N.*" *Oscitans ante ostium.* Bothe.

479 16 (*ansatus*) "'*Comatus*' *Sc.* '*conatus*' *M. C.*" (*meus codex*).

480 26 (*aut ambos mira aut noli mirare de eodem*) "*Locum hunc corruptum esse autumo, sicque restituendum; 'Aut ambos mira aut noli mirare. Idem eodem'; ut sequens exemplum omissum sit.*" *Idem eodem* afterwards Roeper.

481 16 (*lib. V*) "*Quinto S.*"; and so 482 31. *In quinto* Mercier in MS note to his first edition, and in the text of his second. *Quinto* Quicherat.

482 10 (*non tam calleo*) Scaliger would expunge *non tam.*

483 12 (*si me*) "'*Sive.*' *Ita lego.*"

483 36 (*almo*) "*Albo,* λευκόλινος, *Sc.*" *Albo* Faber ap. Quich.

484 19 (*senatis*) "*F. senatuis N.*" So Mercier in his second edition.

489 29 (*qui hoc hic clamoris*) Scaliger would expunge *hoc.*

490 18 (*inscitia, ferocitate atque ferocia*) Scaliger would expunge *ferocitate.*

490 28 (*detundite*) "*Deturbata S.*"

494 1 (*ac ducentum*) "*Atque, Scal.*" So Bouterwek ap. L. Müller.

495 20 (*vim citatam quadrupedum*) "*Vim incitatum quadrupedum N.*"

496 28 (*oratum peteret*) "*F. et petere.*"

496 31 (*fieri contumeliam cuius a te veretur maxime*) "*Leg.* '*contumeliam a te, cuius veretur maxime.*' *N. N.*"

498 8 (*Locrorum*) "*F. lucorum.*" So afterwards Bücheler ap. Ribbeck.

498 10 (*capi sortiri*) "*F. capitis potiri*"; but afterwards he conjectured *captus. Captus potiri* Ianus Dousa.

498 11 The words *idem libro octavo* Scaliger would cut

out, and then join the words *quarum et abundemus rerum et quarum indigeamus* to the line from book 6, thus: "*N. Possim si hortarier illos Quarum et abundemus* etc. *Capitis potiri* he would thus treat as a separate note of Nonius.

498 25 (*gesserint*) "*Lego 'cesserint' N.*" So Lipsius.

500 3 (*misereor saepe studitos volo*) "*Forte 'Misereri saepe stupidos volo.'*"

500 15 (*in solum*) "*N. in os.*"

500 25 (*minuendi refert res*) "*Minuendi quaeque refert res, Scal.*"

500 27 (*rei quae resistit*) "*Reique resistit N.*" So Gifanius, quoted by Mercier in the MS note to his first edition.

501 5 (*omne nomen Ilium par nemo*) "*Scaliger: 'par neminis.'*"

501 13 (*hominem*) "*Hominum S.*" So Mercier in MS note to his first edition, and in the text of his second.

502 12 (*inibo*) "'*Inhio' lego N.*" So Passerat and Faber ap. Quich. and from Passèrat Mercier in MS note to ed. 1, and in ed. 2.

504 19 (*puerumque ut laverent*) "*Laverunt, Sc.*"

505 3 (*aura*) "*Aula N.*" This is known from his *Conjectanea* 69, p. 113.

505 35, 506 1 (*audibo pro audiam, Ennius Telamone, 'more antiquo audibo'*) "*Legendum 'Audibo pro audiam more antiquo Ennius Telam.* Audibo atque aures tibi contra utendas dabo.'" *Audibo pro audiam more antiquo* Gothofred. ap. Quich., and Quicherat himself *Atque* for *neque* ed. 1470.

506 8 (*primum fulgit uti caldum et fornaceum ferrum*) "*Lego 'Primum f. uti c. ex fornacibus ferrum.' Vel 'calidum fornacibus ferrum.'*" *ex fornacibus* Dousa and Passerat.

507 32 (*pater at est negato esse, hic me operibo caput*) "Schegkius, '*Pater adest.' N. 'St.* (*? St. St. ?*) *negato esse hic me, o. c.'*"

509 20 (*disertim dicere plane, palam Titinnio auctore possumus Veliterna*). *Lucillio* Scaliger from the MSS, and *Titinnius Veliterna.*

510 9 (*nunc te obtestor*) "*Nunc ted obtestor, Sc.*"

510 18 (*crudeliter ille*) "*F. illi N.*"

512 13 (*quam duriter vos educavit atque aspere, non negat*) "*Quam duriter Vos educavit aspereque, non negat S.*" So Quicherat.

512 35 (*quoniam*) "*Lego 'quam.'*"

514 18 (*equo*) "*Aequore N.*"

515 30 (*trabem*) "*Trahere, Sc.*"

516 21 (*duos sensim*) "*Sessim, Sc.*"

517 18 (*nam*) "*F. eam.*" Müller proposes *iam.*

518 34 (*Pedius*) "*L. Sc. 'Delius.'*"

520 25 (*modica sunt*) "*L. 'modica sunto' N.*"

528 5 (*vel ad Herculis athla athletae*) "*Forte τὸ 'ad' inducendum.*"

528 25 (*hic Demetrius est natus quod luces habet annus absolutus*) "*Epigramma Varronis sic legendum est. 'Hic Demetrius aestimatus est tot aeneas tot* Quot luces habet annus absolutus. Sc. Scalig.'*" Subsequently, in the *Catalecta*, he wrote *Hic Demetrius aeneus tot aptust* etc.

531 24 (*a forno*) "*Meurs. 'formo,' sed ante te Scaliger.*"

533 8 (*arte*) "*Arce N.*"

534 23 (*in aliis domini delicias faselo nactum tonsili remo vilem flictam solvit*) Iunius conj. *alius...nactus tonsillas litore movit, conflictum* etc. Scaliger says *Suspicor 'Deinde' (vel 'domini') delicias faselo nactus tonsillas litore movit, constrictam solvit.*

534 29 (*indicit*) "*F. incidit.*" So Mercier in the MS note to his first edition, and in the text of his second.

535 10 (*fides*) "*Obsides, Scal.*"

536 5 (*ancorae*) "*Anconae Sc.*"; but on second thoughts he writes "*Lege 'Ancona, vincula quibus antennae tenentur, ut nomen pluralis numeri tantum.' Utitur de bove (? cervo) Gratius in Cynegetico* (87)

'ast ubi lentae
Interdum Libyco fucantur sandice pinnae,
Linteaque extritis lucent anconibus arma.' N."

(*vel omnia*) "*Velum, Sc.*" (*vela* Iunius).

536 7 (*funis enim praecisus cito atque ancora soluta*) "*Cito est Sc. Ancora penultima longa, aut legendum est 'ora.'*"

536 9 (*pro gubernator*) "*Leg. progubernatore.*" The conjecture is older than Scaliger, for Bentinus says *hic me alicubi sic legisse memini 'Qui pro gubernatore se gerens.'* The reading does not, so far as I see, occur in any of the older editions.

536 27 (*sordidum*) "*F. sordidulum.*" So Ianus Dousa.

537 30 (*venusta*) "*Venustet: N.*"

538 15 (*suspendit Laribus marinas molles pilas*) "*S.S.S.S. Suspendit Laribus marinis monilia, lapillos.*" *Marinis* Turnebus ap. Quich.

538 30 (*cum neque aptam mollis humeris fibulam sagus ferret*) "*F. 'mollibus.' Vel 'Cum neque apte mollis humerus fibulam sagi ferret' N.*"

538 31 (*sagaria nunc*) "*'Saga induunt' Colerus: 'numerat,' Scal.*"

539 7 (*cubo in Sardinia ista pedibus*) Iunius conj. *cubo in Sardinianis tapetibus.* "*Sardinianis incubo tapetibus, Sc.*"

539 14 (*diffingitur*) "*Diffingetur, Sc. Detingitur: forte 'detingit.'*"

541 11 (*fluvii*) "*In aliis 'flumina': forsan 'flaminiae' S.*"

542 11 (*in omnibus rebus bonis quotidianis cubo in Sardinianis tapetibus*) "*Quotidianis omnibus rebus bonis Sandinianis incubo tapetibus. S.S.S.*"

543 5 (*aula vel olla*) "*Legendum 'aula vel ola, quam nos ollam dicimus.' Veteres enim litteras non geminabant, ut notat Festus in hac ipsa voce.*" *Vel ola* was afterwards proposed by Roth.

543 10 (*Vulcanum, nec cum novae* etc.) "*Ne novae N.*" "*Olarum N.*"

543 17 (*solvenda*) "*Sorbenda, Sc.*"

544 26 (*tamen tum*) "*Temetum, Sc.*"

545 16 (*Plautus*) "*Laberius N.*"

547 27 (*populo nobilium Tarentinarum*) "*Pocula nobilium toreumatum Sc. Veteres enim omnes 'hunc Tarentarium.'*"

551 27 (*rei quos*) *Reliquos* Bentinus: "*Sc. reiculos.*" *Reiculos* also L. Müller.

553 10 (*quem sequuntur cum rotundis velites leves palmis*) "*Lego ita. Sc. 'Quem cum rutundis velites leves parmis Insignibus sequuntur antesignani Multi quadratis.'*"

554 9 (*sparos lanceae*) "*Lego, 'Sparus et lanceae.'*"

554 14 (*ac sibi restitui et hastas*) "*Lege ex Sallustio, 'At si res postulet, hastas' N.*"

556 6 (*matertera gravia bellica*) "*Materes tela grandia, Sc. F. 'tela Gallica.'*" And at the top of the page he adds *Strabo de Gallor. armis lib. IV, καὶ μέρις παλτοῦ τι εἶδος. l. καὶ ματερίς: compendium scripturae locum corrupit.*

556 9 (*manipuli spartei pice contecti*) "*F. 'parte pice.'*"

HENRY NETTLESHIP.

The notes contained in the foregoing pages were the last work which came from the hand of the late Professor Nettleship. They were written out during the early stages of the illness which terminated in his lamented death, and after they were in type he was unable to revise the proof. They have not therefore had the benefit of his accurate supervision, but Professor J. E. B. Mayor, with his usual kindness, has seen them through the press. [*Edd.*]

§ 16. *DV and AF equidistant from O.*

I have now established that DV often preserve the reading of O where AF corrupt it, and on the other hand that AF often preserve it where DV corrupt it: here follow passages where the reading of O is preserved by neither family but is diversely corrupted in each and must be recovered by comparing the two. These examples constitute additional evidence for my contention that neither DV nor AF can be dispensed with.

I ii 23, 24.

non illis studium uulgo *conquirere* amantes:
illis ampla satis forma pudicitia.

conquirere DVN, *aquirere* AF. Propertius in this poem reproves Cynthia for the richness of her dress: beauty is best unadorned: it was not by any such finery that the heroines of story won their lovers but by their native charms; and then follow the above lines. What 'uulgo conquirere amantes' would mean we can see from Ter. haut. 446 sq. 'ea coacta ingratiis | postilla coepit uictum uolgo quaerere': the sense of the hexameter will be that the ancient heroines were not streetwalkers, Cynthia is! small wonder that Eldick altered *uulgo* to *fuco*. The pentameter and the whole tenour of the context shew what sense is wanted: the heroines did not try to win lovers by any addition to their beauty: we require something like the 'mercatus cultus' of v. 5 'naturaeque decus mercato perdere cultu' and the 'falsus candor' of v. 19 'nec Phrygium falso traxit candore maritum...Hippodamia'. Now the source of the divergency of the MSS I find in *anquirere*, corrupted on

the one hand into *conquirere* by the frequent error *co* for *a*, on the other into *aquirere* by the abbreviation *ā* for *an*. Then for *uulgo*, remembering that *f* and *u* are often confused (IV ix 34 *uana* for *fana*) and that the compendium for *re* is often omitted (Sen. Ag. 161 *lango* for *languore*), I propose *fulgore*:

non illis studium fulgore anquirere amantes.

I xii 19.

mi neque amare aliam neque ab hac *desistere* fas est.

desistere F, *dissistere* AN, *discedere* DV. Either the first or the last may be right, but it is perhaps most scientific to seek the origin of these variations in Heinsius' *desciscere*.

II xiv 5. nec sic Electra, *saluum cum* aspexit Orestem.

saluum cum FN, *suum saluum* DV: the latter is of course corrupt but probably points to the order *cum saluum*: this rhythm, the third foot ending with the end of a word, is common enough in Propertius but avoided by the Ovidian school with whose principles the copyists are imbued.

II xiv 29—32.

nunc ad te, mea lux, ueniet mea litore nauis
seruata. *an* mediis sidat honusta uadis?
quod si forte aliqua nobis mutabere culpa
uestibulum iaceam mortuus ante tuum.

an FN, *in* DV. *quod* DVN, *quae* F. Propertius in this poem exults over the past night which has reconciled him to Cynthia after a long exclusion: he promises to render thankofferings at the shrine of Venus: then follow these verses and conclude the elegy. The above pointing, with its absurd interrogation, is Hertzberg's: I forbear to quote his long paraphrase since it is sufficiently refuted by the fact that it obliges him to render the *quod* of v. 31 (*quae* is of course impossible with his reading) as if it were *nam*. Baehrens punctuates 'nunc ad te, mea lux, ueniet, mea litore nauis | seruata an mediis sidat honusta uadis', which will apparently mean 'nunc ad te ueniet mea nauis, siue litore seruata sidat siue mediis uadis honusta sidat':

The conjectures, some of which assume that 'uenire litore' can mean 'uenire ad litus', are very numerous, but only those of Heinsius and D'Orville are any improvement on the text: I give the latter as the less violent: 'nunc *in* te (sc. 'est' or 'stat'), mea lux, *ueniat sua litora* nauis | seruata, an mediis sidat honusta uadis': the sense is good but the changes very improbable. I think the variation of the MSS between *an* and *in* will help us to a much easier emendation:

nunc *a*[1] te, mea lux, *pendet*, mea litore nauis
soluat, an in mediis sidat honusta uadis.

Propertius is now embarked on a new voyage of love: it rests with Cynthia whether his ship as it starts shall clear the shore or founder in the shoals. The error *ueniet* for *pendet* comes from the frequent confusion of *p* with *u* even in MSS much older than ours, Horace's for instance; the interchange of *soluo* and *seruo* is easy and probably recurs at II xxvii 14; then when *seruatanin* became *seruata an in* the metre required the extrusion of one word, and the one family omitted *in*, the other *an*. In the next verse I read *quae* with F: this connexive use of the relative is not common when it denotes the first or second person, but it is nevertheless quite correct: Ovid met. IX 64 '*qui* postquam...*sinuaui* corpus', 383 sqq. 'care uale coniunx, et tu, germana, paterque. | *qui* (altered, just as in Propertius, to *quod* by the second hand of one MS), si qua est pietas,...frondes *defendite* nostras'. The *quod* of DVN appears to be irreconcilable with all readings of vv. 29 sq. yet proposed.

II xxii 49, 50.

et rursus puerum quaerendo audita fatigat,
quem, quae scire timet, quaerere *plura* iubet.

plura DV, *fata* F, N omits the verse. The lines describe the conduct of a lover 'speranti subito si qua uenire negat.' The 'quaerere' of the pentameter has plainly come from the 'quaerendo' overhead and has ousted some such word as 'promere': the suspicious lover questions his messenger again and again as

[1] *a* is given by one interpolated MS.

to what he has observed at the lady's house. The *plura* of DV is faultless, but that will not content a scientific critic who notices that F has *fata:* he requires the common parent of the two readings; and this Mr Palmer finds in *furta*. The words *furta facta fata* are so much confounded in medieval MSS that when our text gives one we may take whichever we please of the three: at II ii 4 N has *fata* for *furta*. Then on the other hand *furta* closely resembles *purla* which would infallibly be altered to *plura*. The appropriateness of the word, 'infidelities', is evident.

II xxix 41. sic ego tam sancti *custos recludor* amoris.

custos recludor DV, *custodis rector* F, *custode reludor* N: none of these is defensible and the conjectures proposed are many. Propertius is relating how he stole to Cynthia's bedside to see if she were alone: she was, and on awaking upbraided him with his suspicions, 'quid tu matutinus, ait, speculator amicae? | me similem uestris moribus esse putas?' and so on. Burmann proposes *custos eludor:* perhaps *custos deludor* will best explain the phenomena in the MSS: 'thus I prove a fool for my pains in spying on my virtuous mistress': this sense of 'custos' is abundantly illustrated in the lexicons.

II xxxii 33—40.

ipsa Venus, quamuis corrupta libidine Martis,
nec minus in caelo semper honesta fuit,
quamuis Ida [Parim] pastorem dicat amasse
atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam.
hoc et Hamadryadum spectauit turba sororum
Silenique senes et pater ipse chori,
cum quibus Idaeo legisti poma sub antro
subposita excipiens Naica dona manu.

hoc DVN, *non* F. In this passage as it stands the 'legisti' of v. 39 is nonsense: this poem is addressed to Cynthia; but Cynthia never went applegathering on Ida with Silenus and the Hamadryads and the rest. Venus did; and therefore it is rightly held that Propertius here diverts his address to Venus; but the mode in which the MSS make him do so is wrongly

defended, and is libellously described as 'Propertian'. From the practice of authors whose MSS are good and early we learn that either a vocative or a personal pronoun is required in such cases; and here instead of *hoc* or *non* I would write *uos*: 'thou, Venus, and thy lover were seen by the Hamadryads...with whom thou gatheredst' etc. The same correction of *hoc* to *uos* is to be made in Cat. 36 9: 'annales Volusi, cacata charta, | uotum soluite pro mea puella. | nam...uouit... electissima pessimi poetae | scripta tardipedi deo daturam...et *hoc* pessima se puella uidit...uouere'. 'pessima' here can have no other meaning than 'pessimi' just above, that is to say it must be neut. plur. and mean 'pessima scripta': *hoc* therefore cannot be right. But neither can the old correction *haec*. Catullus began by addressing the 'annales', and not until v. 11 'nunc, o caeruleo creata ponto' does he divert his address to anyone else: thenceforward he addresses Venus throughout seven verses, and at v. 18 with 'at uos interea' returns to the 'annales' again. The poem is short and is composed with much artifice; and I call it incredible that at v. 9 he should so have lost his way as to forget he was addressing the 'annales' and to speak of them in the third person. *hoc* then should be *uos*.

II xxxiv 51—54.

harum nulla solet rationem quaerere mundi,
nec cur fraternis luna laboret equis,
nec si post Stygias aliquid *restauerit undas*,
nec si consulto fulmina missa tonent.

restauerit undas DV, *restabit erūpnas* F; *restabit* N, whose scribe knew the quantity of *erumpnas* or *aerumnas* and accordingly left it out. *undas* of course is right, but the form *restauerit* is impossible in an Augustan writer. The vulgate is Wassenberg's *restabimus undas*, a very rough alteration; and instead of the harsh 'aliquid restabimus' one would look for something more like the 'si tamen *e nobis aliquid* nisi nomen et umbra | *restat*' of Ovid amor. III 9 59 or the 'si tamen *extinctis aliquid* nisi nomina *restat*' of trist. IV 10 85. Now the divergency of the MSS would be explained to perfection by

supposing that the archetype had *restabiterundas*: DV then will have altered *b* to *u* and transposed the syllables *it* and *er*; F avoiding these errors will have altered *d* to *p* and transposed it with *n*. But this hypothetical reading wants but one letter to make good sense: Munro restores 'nec si post Stygias aliquid *rest arbiter undas*', 'whether there is really any such thing as the judge on the yonder side of Styx': the indicative amidst subjunctives is very characteristic of Propertius, see III v 25—46. Compare Ovid met. VI 542 sq. 'si numina diuum | sunt *aliquid*', amor. I 12 3 'omina sunt *aliquid*', III 3 23 'aut sine *re* nomen deus est', ex Pont. IV 1 17 'da mihi, *si quid* ea est, hebetantem pectora Lethen', 14 11 '*Styx* quoque, *si quid* ea est', Cic. n. d. III 53 'qui hos deos ex hominum genere in caelum translatos non *re* sed opinione esse dicunt', pro Sest. 71 'respirasse homines uidebantur nondum *re*'; also Prop. IV vii 1 'sunt *aliquid* manes' and III v 39 sqq. 'sub terris sint iura deum...an ficta in miseras descendit fabula gentis | et timor haut ultra quam rogus esse potest', and finally III xix 27 'Minos sedet arbiter Orci', which suggested to Jacob the conjecture 'aliquis sedet arbiter' on which Munro's is based.

III ii 23, 24.

aut illis flamma aut imber subducet honores
annorum aut *ictu pondera* uicta ruent.

ictu pondera F, *ictu pondere* N, *ictus pondere* DV. The objection to the above reading, the vulgate, as also to N's 'ictu, pondere uicta, ruent', is the singular 'ictu' where the sense requires the plural: hence the conjectures 'ipso pondere' and 'tacito pondere'. But the *ictus* of DV will help us here: it is nom. plur., and 'ruent' is transitive as in Virgil and Horace. It would be possible to accept the reading of DV entire, 'the strokes of years will overthrow them, crushed by their own weight'; but the construction will be clearer and the corruptions better explained if we adopt *ictus* from DV and *pondera* from F: 'annorum aut ictus pondera uicta ruent', 'the strokes of years will overcome the massy piles and cast them down':

scribes unacquainted with the transitive use of 'ruo' found this unintelligible and emended it as they could.

IV ii 5 *haec me* turba iuuat, nec templo laetor eburno.

haec me FN, *nec mea* DV: each family gives one word right and one wrong.

IV iv 55—58.

sic, hospes, *pariamne* tua regina sub aula?
dos tibi non humilis prodita Roma uenit.
si minus, at raptae non sint impune Sabinae:
me rape et alterna lege repende uices.

pariamne N, *patrianne* F, *patiare* DV. It does not appear to me that either 'sic' or 'hospes' is suspicious: 'sic' signifies 'on condition of my betraying Rome' as she has just proposed; 'hospes' here as in many other passages duly registered in the lexicons means merely 'stranger', and it is natural that Tarpeia should call Tatius so rather than 'hostis'. But *pariam* on the lips of a Vestal virgin overcome by first love is much worse than premature; and this reading is therefore surrendered by some of N's keenest partisans, as for instance by Mr Leo. *patiare*, accepted by Baehrens, demands the alteration of other words which as I said are not in themselves suspicious: he writes 'sim compar patiare', and no slighter change seems adequate, for 'sospes' is refuted by the 'si minus' of the next distich. The most probable correction proposed is Heinsius' *spatiorne*, though perhaps *spatierne* is preferable: compare Verg. Aen. I 46 'incedo regina': if the *s* were absorbed by the final *s* of 'hospes', it is clear that *patierne* might easily give rise to the variants we find in the MSS. Heinsius' 'dic' for 'sic' may also be right, though it does not seem necessary.

IV xi 69, 70.

et serie fulcite genus: mihi cumba uolenti
soluitur, *uncturis* tot mea fata meis.

uncturis DV, *nupturis* F, neither defensible; N is wanting here. The true reading was recovered long ago by the Italians, *aucturis*: compare Tib. I 7 55 sq. 'at tibi succrescat proles, quae facta parentis | *augeat*', whence it also appears that we ought

here to write *facta* for *fata* with Kindscher and Postgate. In the first letter of the participle all our MSS are wrong; the second is preserved in F and corrupted in DV, the third preserved in DV and corrupted in F.

See also the passages quoted in vol. XXI pp. 139—141.

§ 17. *Doubt between DV and AF.*

It has been established that the two families AF and DV possess equal authority as witnesses to the reading of their lost original. We shall therefore approach without prejudice the consideration of the following passages in which it is hard or impossible to tell which of the two is right.

I iii 31—33.

> donec diuersas *percurrens* luna fenestras,
> luna moraturis sedula luminibus,
> compositos leuibus radiis patefecit ocellos.

percurrens DV, *praecurrens* AFN. The former is read by nearly all editors and is quite satisfactory: 'luna' will then mean the beams of the moon. But if 'praecurrere' could mean 'praeter currere', to run past or in front of a stationary object, *praecurrens* would be still better: 'luna' will then mean the orb of the moon, hurrying along its path in the sky with the officious haste imputed to it in the pentameter. The lexicons quote no instance of 'praecurrere' in this sense: it means to run on in front of another runner or the like; but I agree with Mr Weber, p. 9, that we cannot with confidence deny to 'prae' in this verb the sense of 'praeter' which it has in praeuehor praegredior praeferor praelabor and praefluo.

I viii 11—16.

> nec tibi Tyrrhena soluatur funis harena
> neue inimica meas eleuet aura preces
> . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> et me defixum uacua patiatur *in ora*
> crudelem infesta saepe uocare manu.

in ora is the reading signified by the *in hora* of AF and the *in ḍ̊ura* of N. DV have *arena* which looks at first like a mere repetition from v. 11, and so it may be. But there is something to be said for the conjecture of the elder Burmann who read *harena* here and proposed *ab ora* for v. 11. His aim was to avoid the Leonine jingle 'Tyrrhena...harena', which however has a parallel in I xvii 5 'quin etiam absenti prosunt tibi, Cynthia, uenti': what most favours the conjecture is its introduction of the phrase 'uacua...harena', for which compare II xxv 7 'putris et in *uacua* requiescit nauis *harena*', Luc. VIII 62 'lustrat *uacuas* Pompeius *harenas*', Stat. Theb. III 334 '*uacua* iacet hostis *harena*'.

I ix 20. infernae *uincula nosse* rotae. *uincula nosse* AFN, *noscere uincla* DV: there is nothing to choose. I ix 27. quippe ubi non liceat uacuos *seducere* ocellos. *seducere* AFN, *subducere* DV: none but factitious reasons can be given for preferring one to the other.

I xvii 25, 26.

> at uos, aequoreae formosa Doride natae,
> candida felici soluite uela *choro*.

choro AFN, *noto* DV: either is excellent, and the change is easy both ways: *coro tono noto* or *noto roco coro*. Mr Solbisky who prefers *choro* ingeniously suggests that *coro* was mistaken for *Cōro* and altered to the name of another wind for the sake of the verse.

I xviii 20. fagus et Arcadio pinus *amica* deo.

amica AFN, *amata* DV. They support the former with Claud. rapt. Pros. II 108 'quercus amica Ioui', the latter with Ovid trist. III 39 sqq. 'cur tamen opposita uelatur ianua lauro?... num quia perpetuos meruit domus ista triumphos? | an quia Leucadio semper amata deo est?'

II i 19, 20. Ossan Olympo | *impositum*.

impositum DV, *impositam* AFN. Either is correct: perhaps however, as Hertzberg says, it is more likely that the termination of 'Ossan' should have led a scribe to substitute fem. for masc. than that the opposite change should have been made.

II v 21. nec tibi *periurae* scindam de corpore uestes.

periurae DV, *periuro* FN. *periurae* is clearly the simpler and better; and Volpi compares II xix 6 'nec tibi clamatae somnus amarus erit'. Yet it may be argued on the other hand, as by Mr Solbisky p. 144, that *periuro* is more probably genuine because less obvious. The accidental exchange however of *e* and *o* is so common that no great weight can be assigned to this plea.

II vi 20. nutritus *duro*, Romule, lacte lupae.

duro DVN, *dure* (= *durae*) F. It is hard to choose; and we cannot say for certain whether F speaks for the family AF or only for itself.

II viii 4. ipsum me iugula, *segnior* hostis ero.

segnior DV, *lenior* N, *leuior* F. I see no way to decide between *segnior* and *lenior*; unless we are to prefer the former because scribes are more prone to shorten words than to lengthen them.

II xv 49. tu modo, dum *lucet*, fructum ne desere uitae.

lucet N, *licet* F, *licet* DV. The metaphor of *lucet* is poetical to a modern taste but hardly possible in a Latin writer unless there has preceded something leading up to it; I think it certain however that in this elegy many distichs are out of place, and probable that this line originally followed the couplet (23, 24) 'dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore: | *nox* tibi longa uenit, nec reditura *dies*'. On the other hand *lucet* may well be only a metrical correction of *licet* which Mr Solbisky supports with I xix 25 'quare, *dum licet*, inter nos laetemur amantes'; and possibly the true emendation is to insert 'o' before 'fructum' with Mr Lucian Mueller.

II xix 3, 4.

nullus erit castis iuuenis corruptor in agris.
qui te blanditiis non sinat esse *probam*.

probam FN, *meam* DV. The former is generally accepted: I am inclined however to prefer *meam* as conveying the same

meaning in a less obvious way. I would compare I xi 7 sq. 'an te nescio quis simulatis ignibus hostis | *sustulit e nostris*, Cynthia, *carminibus*', i.e. has seduced you and so removed you from my heart and consequently your name from its place in my songs; II viii 5 sq. 'possum ego in alterius positam spectare lacerto? | *nec mea dicetur, quae modo dicta mea est?*'; Ovid am. III 12 5 sq. '*quae modo dicta mea est*, quam coepi solus amare, | cum multis uereor ne sit habenda mihi'; Cat. 8 17 'quem nunc amabis? *cuius esse diceris?*'

II xxi 13. sic a Dulichio iuuene est *elusa* Calypso. *elusa* FN, *delusa* DV.

II xxiv 30, 31.

iam tibi de timidis iste proteruus erit,
qui nunc se in *tumidum* iactando uenit honorem.

So DVN; i.e. 'qui nunc se iactando uenit in tumidum honorem', a sentence by no means so contorted as many others which Latin poetry will supply: see for instance Munro on Lucr. III 843. But F has *tumide*, and it is possible that we ought to transpose *in* with Paley and read 'qui nunc se *tumide* iactando *in*uenit honorem': for a similar transposition of *in* see Pers. I 131 where instead of 'nec qui abaco numeros et secto *in* puluere metas' one family of MSS gives 'nec qui *in* abaco numeros et secto puluere metas'.

II xxxii 13. et *platanis creber pariter* surgentibus ordo.

So N, *creber platanis pariter* F, *creber pariter platanis* DV: all have *urgentibus* for *surgentibus*. Between N's arrangement and F's there is little to choose: that of DV is decidedly bad. But it explains better than the others how *surgentibus* lost its *s*; and Baehrens therefore may be right in reading *crebris pariter platanis:* for the construction he compares II xiii 23 'desit *odoriferis ordo* mihi *lancibus*'.

II xxxii 23, 24.

nuper enim de te nostra me laedit ad *aures*
rumor et in tota non bonus urbe fuit.

aures DVN, *aure* F. Schneidewin's *maledixit* seems the most

probable emendation of the corrupt *me laedit*. But whether we should retain *aures* and alter *nostra* to *nostras* with most editors, or whether with Baehrens we should take the *nostra...aure* of F to signify *nostram...aurem*, is a separate question and hard to decide.

IV i 89. cum geminos produceret *Arria* natos. *Arria* FN, *Accia* DV: both are Roman names.

IV iii 7, 8.

> te modo uiderunt iteratos Bactra per ortus,
> te modo munitus *hericus* hostis equo.

hericus FN, *hęṙicus* V, *hernicus* D. The name of an eastern nation is wanted. Beroaldus proposes *munito Sericus*, Jacob *munito Neuricus*, and doubtless one or the other is right. If Beroaldus, then the *s* of *sericus* adhered to the foregoing word and changed it through *munitos* to *munitus*, leaving *ericus*, to which FN have merely prefixed the aspirate while D has further corrupted *hericus* into the well known name of an Italian people, V into a well known personal name of medieval times. If Jacob, then V is nearest the truth, D next, FN furthest away: the error *munitus* for *munito* will then be ascribed to the confusion of *o* with ⁹ the abbreviation of *-us*.

IV xi 25, 26.

> Cerberus et nullas hodie petat inprobus umbras,
> et iaceat tacita *laxa* catena sera.

laxa DV, *lapsa* F, N has not the passage. The choice is a question of taste: I myself prefer *laxa*; and F is so carelessly written that we cannot be sure whether *lapsa* is the reading of its family or only a freak of its own.

§ 18. *N as a representative of O.*

I shall here investigate the value of N considered as a representative of O the common parent of AFDV, and the nature and significance of its fluctuation between the two families AF and DV.

We have seen that although N most commonly sides with AF there are nevertheless very many places where it deserts that family to range itself with DV. And we cannot help noticing that in most cases the side which N takes, be it AF or DV, is the right side: not in all cases, but in most. From this fact a hasty observer might infer that N is the most trustworthy representative of O.

But a little reflexion would teach him better. Take any good modern edition, say Lachmann's: we shall find that it, like N, sides now with AF, now with DV; we shall find that it, like N, usually takes the right side; and we shall find that it takes the right side much oftener than N does. But this virtue of correctness of course confers no authority on Lachmann's edition, neither does N's similar virtue confer any authority on it. For it is explicable by the hypothesis that N too is, so to speak, an edition, and has formed its text, as Lachmann formed his, by selection, achieving thereby the merit for which we praise an edition, correctness, and forfeiting the merit for which we praise a MS, integrity. The facts, I say, on the face of them admit this explanation; and when we examine them we shall find that they demand it.

I will first state the truth of the matter and then proceed to prove it true. N, so far as it is a descendant of O, has derived its text mainly from a codex of the family AF; but where it found the readings of that codex unsatisfactory it has resorted to a codex of the family DV and taken readings thence. For proof, I will begin at I ii 14, the first verse where all five MSS are present, and pursue the vacillations of N between the two families: the case will soon be clear.

19 '*nec* Phrygium falso traxit candore maritum' AF, *non* DV: the reading of AF is probably true and certainly void of offence, so N adheres to it. 23 'non illis studium uulgo *aquirere amittes* (*amictes* F)' AF, hiatus false quantity and nonsense: N cannot tolerate this, resorts to the other family, finds *conquirere amantes* there, is satisfied and adopts it. But I shall be disappointed if I am not thought to have made it probable, in my discussion of this passage above[1], that *conquirere* too is

[1] p. 84.

false and that O had *anquirere*: if that is so, we learn here that N had not access to O itself but only knew the readings of O, as we do, through the two families AF and DV. 24 'illis *forma satis ampla* pudicitia' AF: N is disturbed by the false quantity, turns for help to the other family and takes thence the true reading *ampla satis forma*. 26 'uni si qua placet, *una* puella sat est' AF: another false quantity and nonsense too: DV proffer the true reading *culta* and N borrows it. 29 'unica nec desit iucundis gratia *uerbis*' AF: this is inoffensive, so N accepts it. But all the while DV gives the true reading *dictis* which Ovid imitates at met. XIII 127 'neque abest facundis gratia dictis'. Can anything be plainer? when N agrees with DV in the truth, that is because N has been driven to DV by the manifest falseness of AF: when the reading of AF, though false, is tolerable, N is contented with it and DV are left to tell the truth alone.

Here we are arrived at the end of the elegy: all this evidence against the integrity of N has been amassed within eleven verses. But consult the apparatus criticus where you will, its lesson is always the same: no fact presents itself which is inexplicable by my hypothesis: facts present themselves in abundance which are explicable by no other. If N has not formed its text as I assert, why does it never once agree with DV against AF in places where DV give the ill-looking true reading and AF the specious false one? Why does it desert AF for DV in places where the former are right though they seem wrong and the latter are wrong though they seem right?—such places as II xv 26 *uellet* F, *uelles* DVN, or IV vii 85 *Tiburtina* F, *Tiburna* DN? These phenomena are the tokens of an edition: an edition founded mainly on the text of AF and often adhering to that text where, though wrong, it is not obviously wrong; usually deserting that text where it is obviously wrong, and sometimes deserting it where, though right, it is not apparently right; adopting from DV many readings which are both easy and true, some easy readings which are not true, but never one true reading which is not easy.

Equally reconcilable with this hypothesis are certain phe-

nomena which at first sight might possibly be thought to discountenance it. The fact that N not seldom agrees with AF in an obvious corruption where DV offer the obvious truth might seem to indicate that N had not access to the text of DV: for instance at III xiii 32 FN give *uiricoloris*, clearly wrong, DV give *uersicoloris*, clearly right: why did not N adopt it? But the answer is easy: operi longo fas est obrepere somnum: the editor's industry flagged or his attention wandered. Indeed, if we consider the difficulty of such a task in such an age, we shall rather wonder that these oversights occur no oftener than they do. Other phenomena which might be thought to conflict with my supposition are such as IV vi 25 *lunarat* F, *limarat* DVN: here F's reading is clearly the better, DV's clearly the worse: why has N adopted the latter? The answer is to be found in the fact that wherever this phenomenon occurs, and it occurs very seldom, the two readings are palaeographically almost identical. N has not deliberately chosen the false reading: it has merely made the same easy mistake in copying from the text of AF as was made by the parent of DV in copying from the text of O.

I hope therefore to have demonstrated the truth of Baehrens' assertion (prolegg. p. VIII) that N, so far as it derives its text from the archetype of AFDV, derives it through MSS of the two families AF and DV, not through an independent channel. To demonstrate this is to demonstrate the falsity of the stemmata codicum proposed by Messrs Solbisky Plessis and Weber: but that has been demonstrated already by other methods. Here I desire only to insist on the corollary that N, as a witness to the reading of O, is less deserving of credence than any one of the four codices AFDV. Wholly useless it is not, even in this aspect; for in those books where A fails us N often serves to confirm the testimony of F and so to assure us better what the reading of the family AF really was. But the element of singular and transcendent merit which N possesses is derived, not from the archetype of AFDV, but from that other source which I denominate Z.

§ 19. *AFDV considered severally.*

I will now examine the few instances in which one alone of the four codices AFDV preserves a true reading or a trace of the truth. From this list I exclude the unique readings presented by F in the absence of A which have been already considered and which would presumably be found in A also if that MS were entire.

A.

It curiously happens that A exhibits, in the whole of the verses it contains (I i 1 to II i 63), only one true reading not known to us from FNDV. This is the correct spelling *solacia* in I v 27 'non ego tum potero *solacia* ferre roganti' where the rest have *solatia*. And this solitary distinction loses something of its effect when we observe that A gives *cum* for *tum* in the same verse: it may well be that the archetype after all had the false form *solatia* and that A has merely blundered into the right way through its carelessness about *t*'s and *c*'s. In every other place where A gives a true reading, that true reading is also given by F or by N or by both.

The fact however remains that A is the most faithful representative of its family; and the following examples will display the nature of its value to us. The codex N, as we have seen, frequently deserts the family AF to side for the nonce with DV: now in these cases it is often only the presence of A that enables us to discover what the reading of the family AF really is. For F is most negligently written, and we cannot tell whether its blunders are derived from its exemplar or peculiar to itself unless we have A to set beside it. Thus at I ii 26 *culta* DVN, *una* AF, viii 1 *cura* DVN, *culpa* AF, xii 10 *dinidit* DVN, *diuitis* AF, xiii 5 *fama* DVN, *forma* AF, the presence of A informs us that F got these errors from X and did not itself originate them; and on the other hand at xi 6 *restat* DVNA, *monstrat* F, xvii 13 *uela* DVNA, *bella* F, xviii 31 *mihi* DVNA, *tibi* F, xix 4 *exequiis* DVNA, *obsequiis* F,

we learn that F's mistakes are its own. But so soon as A disappears we are left without a test, and we are taught its value by the perplexity in which its absence plunges us. Most of all do we miss it in sundry places where F omits a word about which DV on one side and N on the other bear contradictory witness. Take IV i 15 'nec sinuosa *cauo* pendebant uela theatro': *cauo* N, *suo* DV, om. F. Whence did N derive the true reading *cauo*? and what was the reading of O? no answer is possible. Suppose now that A were present. If A gave *cauo* we should know *cauo* to be the reading of X, accidentally omitted by F, and also the reading of O, corrupted to *suo* by Y the parent of DV. If A gave *suo* we should know that *suo* was the reading of X and of O, and that N therefore derived its *cauo* from Z. If A omitted the word we should know that X omitted it, and though we should not know what the reading of O was, we should have little doubt that at any rate it was not *cauo*. And whatever A exhibited, it must necessarily teach us something which now we do not know. We suffer a like uncertainty through its absence at III xxii 23 sq. '*Clitumnus* ab Vmbro | tramite' (*litumnus* N, *licimi-nus* D, *liciinnus* V, om. F) and IV ii 28 'corbis *in* inposito pondere messor eram' (*in* N, *ab* DV, om. F).

Thus much in defence of A, lest any one should despise it because of the accident that in one place only is it the sole preserver of a true reading.

F.

There is at least one passage in which F displays a striking superiority not only over the opposite family DV but over its own near relatives A and N: II i 31, 32.

> aut canerem Aegyptum et Nilum, cum *attractus* in urbem
> septem captiuis debilis ibat aquis.

attractus AN, which is indefensible; *tractus* DV, which will not explain the corruption. Baehrens and Palmer have independently arrived at the correction *atratus* which is accepted by Solbisky and others and will probably become the vulgate:

the similar error *attractis* for *atratis* occurs at III v 34. Now F outshines A and N by giving *atractatus*, that is *atractus*: merely *ct* for the *t* of the true reading, and even this error corrected.

At I iii 40 it seems that F rightly gives *qualis* (acc. plur.) where ANDV have *quales*. Still more noteworthy is F's retention of this form in *leuis* at II i 49, where the agreement of DV shews it to be correct, while F's own brethren A and N have altered the inflexion to *leues*.

There is one more place where F alone exhibits what I strongly suspect to be the hand of Propertius; but this I fear is no more than a lucky accident: I viii 35, 36.

dotatae regnum uetus Hippodamiae
et quas Elis *opes* ante pararat *equis*.

opes...equis ANDV, *equis...opes* F: the latter arrangement, distributing adjective and substantive, 'quas' and 'opes', between the two halves of the pentameter, is preferred by the elegiac poets in general and Propertius in particular. But it appears incredible that so wanton an alteration as the transposition of the two words should have been made independently by A and by the parent of DV; and we are accordingly bound to suppose that *opes...equis* was the reading of O, and that F has only by an accident restored the correct order, if correct it be.

The above examples, let me say once more, are all drawn from that portion of the text which is contained by A as well as F, and exclude a large number of true readings, already considered, in which the singularity of F seems due merely to the absence of A.

D.

D alone preserves the true reading in the seven passages which follow.

II iii 42. hic dominam exemplo ponat in *arte* meam. *arte* D, *ante* VFN. II iii 51. turpia perpessus uates est uincla *Melampus*. *melampus* D, *uglampus* VN, *inlampus* F. II ix 2.

hoc ipso *eiecto* carior alter erit. *eiecto* D, *electo* VFN. II xiii 12. auribus et *puris* scripta probasse mea. *puris* D, *pueris* VFN. It is possible that this divergency indicates *pureis*. III xvi 25. di faciant, mea *ne* terra locet ossa frequenti. *ne* D, *nec* VFN. III xxiv 33. uellere tum *cupias* albos a stirpe capillos. *cupias* D, *cupies* V, *capias* FN. IV v 36. natalem *Mais* Idibus esse tuum. *maiis* D, *malis* VFN.

There are also three places in which D has retained an old spelling which the other MSS have modernised: II i 23 *Karthaginis* D, *Carthaginis* VAFN; III vii 43 *uorteret* D, *uerteret* VFN; IV x 44 *gula* D, *gyla* VFN.

But the greatest service rendered us by D singly is I think in IV i 17—19, a passage which the other MSS exhibit thus:

> nulli cura fuit externos quaerere diuos,
> cum tremeret patrio pendula turba sacro,
> annuaque accenso *celebrare* Palilia faeno.

That is, in ancient times no one troubled to seek after foreign gods and no one troubled to celebrate the Palilia; which is absurd, for of course every one celebrated the Palilia: Lachmann accordingly restores sense by writing *annua at* for *annuaque*. But D points the way to an easier correction when instead of *celebrare* it offers *celebrate*, that is to say *celebrāte* or *celebrante*. The construction is 'cum tremeret turba, faenoque Palilia celebrante' = 'tremente turba faenoque P. celebrante' or 'cum tremeret turba faenumque P. celebraret': for a similar co-ordination of temporal clause with ablative absolute see Ovid met. v 362 sq. '*postquam exploratum* satis *est*, loca nulla labare, | *depositoque metu*'. The figure by which the lighted 'faenum' instead of those who set it alight is said to celebrate the Palilia is the same as occurs in v. 23 'lustrabant compita porci'.

D moreover, like A, makes its value felt by the inconveniences which attend its absence. It lacks the first elegy and the first 13 verses of the second; and within this small portion of the text there are at least three differences of reading which we cannot track to their source for want of D to help us. They are cases where a contradiction occurs between AF on the one hand and VN on the other: I i 1 *fecit* AF, *cepit* VN; 13

arbore AF, *uulnere* VN; 22 *placeat* AF, *palleat* VN. These variations are susceptible of two explanations: that N has deserted, as it often does, the family AF and adopted the reading of the family DV; or that V, as it does not infrequently[1], has deserted the tradition of O and adopted, apparently from the source which I call Z, the reading which also presents itself in N. If D were here and gave *cepit uulnere palleat*, we should know that the former explanation was right; if it gave *fecit arbore placeat*, the latter; but now we must rest in doubt.

V.

V alone preserves the true reading in III i 26:

fluminaque Haemonio comminus *isse* uiro.

isse V, *esse* DN, *ille* F.

The case is less clear in III iii 41, 42.

nil tibi sit rauco praeconia classica cornu
flare nec Aonium *cingere* Marte nemus.

cingere V, *tingere* DF, *tinguere* N. *cingere* is read by Lachmann Hertzberg and Bachrens, *tinguere* by Haupt Mueller and Palmer: I see no solid ground for a decision.

In IV viii 23,

Serica nam taceo uolsi carpenta nepotis,

if this generally accepted emendation of Beroaldus' is right, V comes nearest the truth with *sirica uam*: D has *si riga uam*, FN *si riganam*.

In two places V seems to preserve the genuine spelling: III vii 39 *triumphalis* (acc. plur.) V, *triumphales* DFN: II xxviii 49 *aput* V, *apud* DFN.

There is one passage more where V has perhaps retained a fragment of truth which the other MSS have obliterated: and I gladly seize the opportunity of discussing it by reason of its great interest and difficulty: IV v 19, 20.

exorabat opus uerbis ceu blanda perure
saxosamque ferat sedula culpa uiam.

[1] pp. 115 sq.

This gibberish should describe how an old procuress poisons the mind of the poet's mistress with her insidious counsels. In the first place the unmeaning *exorabat,* which some editors alter with no good result into *exornabat,* should be written *exercebat*: *o* for *e* and *a* for *ce* are common mistakes. Now what is the simile? plainly the wearing away of a hard substance by gentle and continuous friction. Three words at least, *perure ferat* and *culpa,* must be corrupt. *ferat,* for which *terat* and *terit* were formerly proposed, is corrected with certainty by Messrs Rossberg and Palmer to *forat.* Instead of *culpa* v gives *talpa,* and the same conjecture had occurred to Mr Rossberg who writes 'ceu blanda*que rura* | saxosamque *forat* sedula *talpa* uiam', most unhappily: if it is meant that moles burrow holes in stones, that is false; if this is not meant, 'saxosam' misleads and the simile comes to naught; nor is it any less ridiculous to say in Latin that a mole 'forat blanda rura' than to say in English that it tunnels the smiling landscape. Turn then from *talpa* to Jacob's conjecture *gutta* (*lympha* had been already proposed) which in capital letters is easily confused with *culpa*: we have now the favourite image of the water wearing the stone, employed again by Propertius at II xxv 16, as also by Lucretius Tibullus and Ovid. *perure* remains: *perurit* and *pererrat* are quite inappropriate verbs, and *terebrat* recedes too far from the ductus litterarum; moreover 'blanda', if it is to be an epithet of 'gutta', is absurd: I propose therefore to remodel the passage with these very minute alterations:

exercebat opus, uerbis *heu* blanda, *perinde*
saxosam *atque* forat sedula gutta uiam.

For 'uerbis blanda' see [Phaedr.] appendix fabularum 23 18 'qui, *uerbis blandus,* fraudem celat pectore', Hor. epist. II 1 135 'docta prece blandus': for the confusion of *perinde* with *perure* compare Ovid her. VII 84 where the MSS are divided between *inde* and *ure.* If now I am right in this restoration, V is perhaps to be commended as preserving a trace which has perished from the other MSS: instead of *saxosamque ferat* it gives *saxosam feratque,* which may mean that the change of *atque* to *que* came to pass through the transposition *ferat atque*

and the consequent absorption of one *at* by the other. But the change occurs in other places where no such explanation is possible, as at Verg. georg. IV 139 *idem atque* M, *idemque* P.

Appendices.

f *and* v.

We saw that, in many of the places where N gives a better reading than O, that same better reading is also given by f or v or both. It is therefore necessary to enquire whether f or v preserves any element of a genuine tradition which has not found its way into N. Here we must advance with extreme caution; for it is abundantly evident that many of the readings given by f and very many of those given by the various hands in V which Baehrens denotes all together by the sign Vm.2, and to which I am thus obliged to assign the single tally v, are the merest conjectures. Those only therefore among the lections of f and v can we reckon as genuine for certain, which preserve not the truth but a vestige of the truth, and which since they make no sense cannot be ascribed to conjectural emendation. But if we find that there are in f and v such lections as these, then we shall be disposed to refer to the same untainted source certain true readings in f and v which though they may be conjectural are nevertheless by no means easy or obvious conjectures.

In the following passages we recover the truth from relics preserved by f or v.

I xx 51, 52.

> his, o Galle, tuos monitus seruabis amores,
> formosum nymphis credere *uisus* Hylam.

'nunc tu seruabis amorem, cum hucusque nymphis puerum tuum credere uisus sis' Hertzberg; but if the poet had meant this he would have made more of it: we should have heard of Gallus' negligence at the beginning of the poem, not in the very last verse, where it takes us quite by surprise. Therefore acuter critics, as Lachmann and Baehrens, have held the line

corrupt, and the latter after enumerating the conjectures *tutus nisus cautus fisus* concludes 'nondum uerum repertum est'. Nondum, in the spring of 1880; but it was found in the autumn. Instead of *uisus* v reads *rursus*, which, mark, being meaningless is therefore no conjecture, and would consequently demand attention even if no scruple were suggested by *uisus*. Mr Palmer hence emended 'formosum *ni uis perdere rursus* Hylam', 'unless you wish to repeat the loss of Hylas': *p* and *c* are commonly interchanged, so are *u* consonant and *f*, and *nīfis* means *nymphis*. But from the *uisus* of O and N we learn that Propertius spelt the adverb *rusus*: this form is often preserved in the best MSS of the best writers, as in Virgil's at georg. II 232 and III 335.

II i 27—35.

nam quotiens Mutinam aut ciuilia busta Philippos
aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae
euersosque focos antiquae gentis Etruscae
et Ptolomaeeae litora capta Phari,
aut canerem *Aegyptum* et Nilum, cum atratus in urbem
septem captiuis debilis ibat aquis,
aut regum auratis circumdata colla catenis
Actiaque in Sacra currere rostra Via,
te mea musa illis semper contexeret armis.

I have given what I hold to be the true reading of v. 31. I will at first mention only the variants of AFNDV: *cyptum* AN, *ciptum* F, *cyprum* DV. Cyprus is here quite out of place: the fact that Antonius transferred that island to the kingdom of Egypt is very poor cause for numbering it among the triumphs of Augustus: *cyprum* then is an attempt to make sense of the earlier corruption *cyptum*. To this therefore we turn; and I assert that palaeographically the old conjecture *Aegyptum* is easier than Baehrens' *Coptum*, since the loss of one *e* in the sequence *canerēegyptum*, and the change of G to C, together constitute a slighter alteration than is *y* for *o*. But it is objected that *Aegyptum* is bad in sense; 'neque enim' says Mr Solbisky p. 147 'nudum nomen eius terrae, quam poeta uerbis *Ptolomaeei litora capta Phari* et Nilo significauit,

medium inter haec interpositum esse potest'. Now as to 'litora capta Phari', this is that same misapprehension of the passage which led Schrader to write *aut* for *et* in v. 30 and *et* for *aut* in v. 31 in order that Pharos and the Nile might not be disjoined. All this will be refuted by the observation that vv. 27—30 refer to the *wars* of Augustus, vv. 31—34 to his *triumphs*: the point of disjunction is at the end of v. 30, and the contents of that verse may therefore be banished from our mind while we are emending v. 31. We have only to consider whether both Egypt and the Nile would appear in the triumphal pageant; and this question is easy to solve: Ovid trist. IV 2 41 sqq. 'cornibus hic fractis, uiridi male tectus ab ulua, | decolor ipse suo sanguine *Rhenus* erat. | crinibus en etiam fertur *Germania* passis', ars I 223 sqq. 'hic est *Euphrates*, praecinctus harundine frontem: | cui coma dependet caerula, *Tigris* erit: | hos facito Armenios: haec est Danaeia *Persis*', Sil. xvii 636 sqq. 'mox uictas tendens *Carthago* ad sidera palmas | ibat, et *effigies orae* iam lenis *Hiberae*, | terrarum finis *Gades*, ac laudibus olim | terminus Herculeis *Calpe*, *Baetis*que lauare | solis equos dulci consuetus fluminis unda, | frondosumque apicem subigens ad sidera mater | bellorum fera *Pyrene*, nec mitis *Hiberus* | cum simul illidit ponto quos attulit amnes'. I claim then that there is no excuse for refusing to *Aegyptum* its place in the text. And if *Aegyptum* is right, then f, which gives *giptum*, has preserved more of the truth than any other witness; for *i* and *y* may be considered the same thing in MSS like ours.

IV vi 25, 26.

tandem aciem geminos Nereus lunarat in arcus,
armorum *et* radiis picta tremebat aqua.

Instead of *et* v gives *q;* (=*que*) which contravenes the metre and is motiveless as an interpolation. A possible suggestion would be *armorumque radis*, for Propertius has not only the genitives *Mari Deci Tati* but the nominative *Gabi*. But *picta* is unsatisfactory: to describe the water as 'picta' by the reflexion of the brightly coloured prows of ships would be a correct use of the word; but the reflexion of light from weapons

is virtually of one colour with the reflexion from water, and water which catches the light from weapons suffers no change of hue. Dausqueius and Heinsius therefore conjectured *icta*: the corruption is explained if we write 'armorum radiisque icta': for the elision compare I v 32 'non inpune illa rogata uenit' and III xxii 10 'Herculis Antaeique Hesperidumque choros'. *q; icta* was taken for *picta: q;* was afterwards written overhead as a correction and then inserted in the wrong place, where only v preserves it: ON finding it incompatible with the metre alter it to *et.*

IV xi 29, 30.

si cui fama fuit per auita tropaea decori,
et Numantinos regna *loquuntur* auos.

So DV; F omits v. 30, and N has lost the page which contained it. The line is nonsense and 'Nūmantinos' is a false quantity. Now f reads thus: '*aera* Numantinos regna *locuntur* auos'; and *aera* is also given by v. *locuntur* is not the spelling of a renascence corrector, and Baehrens is clearly right when with heinous infidelity to his principles he adopts it. *aera* again is no interpolation, since it cannot be construed; and *era* will explain the corruption *et.* Now as to the original sense of the verse there can be no doubt: it was '*nobis* fama per auita tropaea decori est': the 'si cui' of the hexameter, as Baehrens says, admits no other sequel. We may write

aera Numantinos *nostra* locuntur auos,

'the spoils of armour in our house tell of our ancestors who took Numantia'. The three first letters of '*nos*tra' might be absorbed in the three last of 'Numanti*nos*', and the remaining *tra* corrected into the first word that came to hand. The above emendation was formerly proposed by Mr Palmer who afterwards abandoned it for the incoherent *Afra...regna* of Scaliger. Perhaps however a better way of obtaining the required sense is to read with Baehrens

nostra Numantinos *signa* locuntur auos.

aera may well be a relic of *nostra* or *ñra*, as *sera* is at Ovid fast. III 738; and we had *signa* and *regna* confused in Prop.

IV ii 2 (vol. XXI pp. 123 sq.), where add Ovid fast. v 152. I should add that our singular indebtedness to f and v in this passage does not prove so much for their singular merit as did the instances adduced before; for it is very likely that if we could recover the lost page of N we should find *aera* there also.

In the passages which now follow it appears that v or f has preserved the true reading corrupted by all our other witnesses. I exclude a great many instances in which the reading of v or f, though peculiar to themselves and indisputably true, may be plausibly explained as a conjectural emendation. For example, even the 'nigraque funestum *concinit* omen auis' of v at II xxviii 38 where the other authorities give *condidit*, even this reading, which is proved to be true by Ovid am. III 12 2 'omina non albae concinuistis aues' and was by no means easy to recover by conjecture, may yet be a conjecture after all. But in the cases here to be adduced this hypothesis is impossible or else highly improbable; and we have learnt from the evidence above that f and v contain at any rate some element of truth which is not drawn from conjecture.

III xv 7. tertius *haut* multo minus est cum ducitur annus.

haut v, clearly the source of *haud* O and *aut* N; and imagine a renascence interpolator of V, where *haud* stood in the text, spontaneously altering this approved form into the then unfashionable *haut!*

I xi 9—12.

> atque utinam mage te remis confisa minutis
> paruula Lucrina cumba moretur aqua,
> aut teneat clausam tenui *teutantis* in unda
> alternae facilis cedere lympha manu.

teutantis DVN, *tuetantis* AF, *teutrantis* v, i.e. *Teuthrantis*. This generally accepted reading is I think very plausibly defended by Hertzberg: Teuthras was king of Mysia, and from him the south-west of that country derived the name Teuthrania: now on that coast lay the Aeolic Cyme which was thought to have shared in founding the Campanian Cumae: '*Teuthrantis*

lympha' (*Teuthrantis* a feminine adjective) therefore means 'Cumana lympha', probably the lacus Acherusius, just as 'Lydus' and 'Maeonius' often stand for 'Tuscus'. There may be some significance in the fact that Silius XI 290 bestows the name of Teuthras on a native of Cumae. It is worth mentioning further that in Sen. Herc. fur. 477 some MSS have *teutantis*, like DVN, where they evidently mean *Teuthrantis*, and that in Ovid her. IX 51 *Teuthrantia* is corrupted to *teuthantia* and in trist. II 19 to *teutantia* also. The verse wants no more change: when Baehrens prolegg. p. XXII enquires 'quid hoc noui est, per deos te oro, *in unda lympha te teneat?*' we reply that it is nothing new at all, any more than I xxii 6 sqq. '*puluis* Etrusca ...*tu* nullo miseri contegis ossa *solo*' or the similar examples collected by Dr Postgate, Select Elegies p. lxviii.

I xx 25—28.

> hunc duo sectati fratres, Aquilonia proles,
> hunc super et Zetes, hunc super et Calais,
> oscula suspensis instabant carpere *palmis*,
> oscula et alterna ferre supina fuga.

After the vain attempts of others to make out that *palmis* can stand for *alis*, Hertzberg explains 'suspensis palmis' by the remark 'pendere et suspensum esse de omni uolucrum parte dicitur'. Perhaps; but when a man walks along the street, except he goes on all fours, his 'palmae' are no less 'suspensae' than if he flew: in order that Zetes and Calais may be described as flying, the epithet 'suspensae' must be applied to some part of the body which is not 'suspensum' except in flying. Thus Statius silu. II 7 4 with the words 'pendentis ungulae' depicts Pegasus as a flying horse: 'pendentis caudae' would not have that effect. Here instead of *palmis* v offers *plantis*, which should be accepted even if a conjecture; but a conjecture it cannot be unless we are to confess that an interpolator of the fifteenth century considered the passage with more attention than a long series of modern editors. I would compare Stat. Theb. VI 638 sqq. 'uix campus euntem | sentit, et exilis *plantis* interuenit aer, | raraque non fracto *uestigia* puluere *pendent*'.

II ii 3, 4.

cur haec in terris facies humana moratur?
Iuppiter, *ignoro* pristina furta tua.

'Jove, I am ignorant of your old amours' may be instantly dismissed as nonsense. Hence Broukhusius, Volpi, Huschke and Hertzberg render *ignoro* as 'nihili aestimo', taking 'furta' to mean 'puellas amatas'. *ignoro* has no such meaning: it possesses, in some passages quoted by these scholars, the meaning 'I disregard' = 'I refuse to recognise' possessed by the English 'ignore': it does not possess the meaning 'I disregard' = 'I contemn'. When it is proposed to make the verse an interrogation, and asserted that 'am I ignorant of your old intrigues, Jupiter?' is Propertius' way of saying 'are they myths or realities?', I can only reply that, if so, it might be Propertius' way of saying anything. There is an end to all these desperate devices if we take the *ignosco* proffered by v and by the second hand in N: now that Propertius has seen how beautiful a mortal woman can be, he forgives the old amours of Jove with the daughters of men. The construction 'ignosco aliquid' without an 'alicui', like the similar use of 'inuideo', is rare but not unexampled. *sc* is confused with *r*, and some MSS at Ovid trist. IV 4 8 give *ignoras* for *ignoscas*.

II xii 17, 18.

quid tibi iucundum est siccis habitare medullis?
si *puer* est alio traice *puella tuo*.

puer...puella tuo ON, *pudor...tela puer* v. The *tela* of v is universally accepted, for the *bella* of some late MSS will not serve; *pudor* too is adopted by all modern editors except Baehrens and Mueller; but at the end of the verse all read *tua*. Baehrens followed by Mr Lucian Mueller writes 'i, puer, en alio traice tela tua'. I assert that neither this nor the 'si pudor est, alio traice tela tua' of the vulgate explains the apparition *puella tuo* in ON. Such meaningless and unmetrical words are no interpolation but a dull and honest mistake: how did it arise? The change of *tela* to *puella* may have been caused it is barely possible, by the *puer* preceding: but why *tua*, protected by the similar inflexion of *tela* or *puella*, should

have been altered to *tuo*, it is hard to conceive. I shall essay to defend the reading of v; and I will begin at the beginning of the verse. Mr Lucian Mueller impugning 'si pudor est' says that 'priorem uersum respicienti non erit dubium quin Propertio, si apte uellet loqui, potius fuerit dicendum *si sapis*'. I reply by citing an epigram of Martial's in which the phrase is used with precisely the same shade of meaning as here: I insert in brackets parallel verses from this elegy of Propertius: Mart. x 90 'quid uellis uetulum, Ligella, cunnum? [Prop. 17 quid tibi iucundum est siccis habitare medullis?] | quid busti cineres tui lacessis? [Prop. 20 non ego, sed tenuis uapulat umbra mea] | tales munditiae decent puellas [Prop. 19 intactos isto satius temptare ueneno]...erras, si tibi cunnus hic uidetur | ad quem mentula pertinere desit [again Prop. 20 non ego sed...umbra mea]. | quare, *si pudor est*, Ligella, noli | barbam uellere mortuo leoni'. The formula is employed not merely in serious objurgation as at Iuu. III 153 sq. 'exeat, inquit, | *si pudor est*, et de puluino surgat equestri', but in mild or playful remonstrance, as at Prop. I ix 33 'quare, *si pudor est*, quam primum errata fatere', Ovid am. III 2 23 sq. 'tua contrahe crura, | *si pudor est*, rigido nec preme terga genu', Verg. buc. VII 44 'ite domum pasti, *si quis pudor*, ite iuuenci'. Mr L. Mueller makes the further objection that 'nisi antiquitus traditum fuisset illud *puer*, uix ac ne uix quidem in N [et O] pro *tela* scriptum esset *puella*'; and this is an effective argument against the vulgate but will lose all its force if we accept the whole reading of v. For then we shall hold that *puer* was not only 'antiquitus traditum' but placed where it had much more power to produce *puella* than at the beginning of the verse. In *traice tela puer* the letters *te* were lost after *ce* and then added above or in the margin; then from the elements *puer* and *la* and *te* the scribe constructed *puel-la te* and altered *te* to *tuo* for the metre. The reading of v, if not genuine, is a surprisingly subtle conjecture.

II xxix 35, 36.

apparent non ulla toro uestigia presso,
signa *uoluptatis*, nec iacuisse duos.

uoluptatis DV, which is satisfactory enough, and of which the *uoluntatis* found in FN may be a corruption. But f gives *uolutantis*, which is approved by Lipsius and Heinsius and by Lachmann, who however thinks it may be a 'felix error'; and so indeed it may. An interpolation it can hardly be, since the word and the form are a far less obvious correction of *uoluntatis* than *uoluptatis* would have been. The postponement of *nec* (or *non* as O reads) is one of those concessions to metre so frequent in Latin pentameters: compare III xxi 16 'qualiscumque mihi tu*que*, puella, uale'. Hertzberg objects that the verb *uoluto* is too coarse for the occasion; but this, as Baehrens says, is to forget that Cynthia wounded by unjust suspicion is here speaking in anger and contempt.

IV iv 63, 64.

et iam quarta canit venturam bucina lucem
ipsaque in Oceanum sidera *lapsa* cadunt.

With *lapsa* the addition of 'ipsa' is senseless: '*even* the stars have fallen': then something else has fallen; and what is that something else? the context gives no reply. *lassa* v, which immediately invests 'ipsa' with a meaning: 'the stars, weary like me'. Compare Sen. Herc. fur. 125 sq. 'iam rara micant *sidera* prono | *languida* mundo'. Again in I iii 45,

dum me iucundis *lapsam* sopor inpulit alis,

one enquires 'unde quo lapsam?' and gets no answer: *lassam*, given by 'corr. V' (? = v), is intelligible.

I will now enquire what relation subsists between fv on the one hand and N on the other.

Baehrens prolegg. p. IX asserts that where Nfv agree together N has copied its reading from f or v. The assertion is baseless, for it is not yet established that even F and V, far less f and v, are older than N. And Baehrens himself is constrained to admit immediately afterwards that many of N's readings, where it differs from O, are not derived from f or v but from some other source: then why not all? Obviously his assertion will not bear serious criticism: it is only a surreptitious attempt to prejudice the reader against N.

Mr Plessis p. 39, opposing Baehrens' opinion, asserts that 'le contraire est certain, si F et V, comme je crois l'avoir établi, sont postérieurs d'un siècle et demi à N', a characteristic example of Mr Plessis' ratiocination: because f and v are later than N, therefore they are copied from N. This conclusion, to judge from the facts which we have just surveyed, is no less false than it is irrational; but I pause a moment to signalise the futility of the argument with which it is impugned by Mr Leo, who says p. 445 that the corrections of f and v are certainly not derived from N: 'satis hoc probat IV 11, 17—76 locus in N omissus'. Now the fact is that those verses are absent from N simply because the leaf on which they were written is now torn out. But assume what this very fact shews to be false: assume that N originally omitted them: what would that prove? merely that the readings of f and v *in those verses* are not derived from N. But we knew already, without this proof, that hundreds of the readings of f and v in all the four books are not derived from N: 'permulta' confesses Mr Leo himself 'ab N aliena a correctoribus in V et F interpolata, alia recte emendata sunt'. So even when we have granted Mr Leo his false premiss we find that it will not help him to his conclusion. Yet premiss and conclusion alike are accepted by Mr Solbisky p. 172.

But from the tedious though necessary task of refuting what ought never to have been written I return to the question in hand: what relation subsists between fv on the one hand and N on the other? In the passages just considered we find f or v or both together preserving elements of genuine tradition which N does not preserve: here at least then f and v are not derived from N. On the other hand at the beginning of this treatise we found N preserving elements of genuine tradition (I vi 3, III v 6, IV i 106, iii 55 etc.) which are preserved neither by f nor by v: there at least then N is not derived from f or v. Therefore, in those places where elements of genuine tradition are preserved by Nfv in common, we have no ground for supposing either that N derives them from fv or that fv derive them from N.

The simplest hypothesis is that which I have embodied in

my stemma codicum: that f and v derive these elements from the same lost MS whence N derives them. This supposition is consistent with all the facts before us. We have seen that Nfv often present the same genuine reading: that is natural, if their source is the same. We have seen that less frequently N presents a genuine reading not given by fv, or fv present a genuine reading not given by N: that is easily explicable: it means that for the nonce N has been copying more carefully than fv, or fv more carefully than N, the text of the exemplar. If however anyone should prefer to say that f and v derive their genuine readings not from the same exemplar as N but from another MS closely resembling it, I should be unable to confute his opinion, just as he would be unable to substantiate it.

Agreement of V with N.

I shall here bring together certain passages in which V quits DF, its fellow-descendants of O, and ranges itself with N.

II iv 17. hostis si quis erit nobis, amet *ille* puellas. *ille* NV, *ipse* DF. II vi 11. me *laedit* si multa tibi dedit oscula mater. *laedit* Itali, *laedet* NV, *laedes* DF. II x 10. *nunc* aliam citharam me mea Musa docet. *nunc* NV, *nāque* F, *nanque* D. II xii 12. nec quisquam ex illo uulnere sanus *abit*. *abit* NV, *erit* DF. II xiv 11. at, *dum* demissis supplex ceruicibus ibam, dicebar sicco uilior esse lacu. *dum* NV, *cum* DF. II xx 10. sint mea *uel* Danaes condita membra domo. *uel* NV, *nec* DF. II xxii 16. et Phrygis insanos *caeditur* ad numeros. *caeditur* NV, *quaeritur* DF. II xxx 1, 2. tu licet usque | ad *Tanain* fugias. *tanain* N, *tanaim* V, *tantam* DF. II xxxiv 30. nil iuuat in magno *uester* amore senex. *uester* NV, *noster* DF. III iv 22. me sat erit *Sacra* plaudere posse Via. *sacra* NV, *media* DF. III v 11, 12. hostem | quaerimus atque armis *nectimus* arma noua. *nectimus* NV, *quaerimus* DF. III xxiv 38. euentum *formae* disce timere tuae. *formae* N, V in ras., *dominae* DF. IV v 39, 40. semper habe morsus circa tua colla recentes, | dentibus *alterius* quos putet esse datos. *alterius* DF, *alternis* NV.

Now to consider the meaning of these phenomena. I hold that the reading in which D and F, representatives of both families, concur, was the reading of O, and that the scribe of V has employed for the emendation of his text the same codex Z whence N derived so much, or, if you will, another codex closely resembling Z. I think it unlikely that this hypothesis, which seems at any rate simple and adequate, will encounter much opposition; but I may call attention to one circumstance which tells strongly in its favour and against the explanation which might conceivably be offered, that the dissension between V and DF arises from a dittography in their parent O. The fact I speak of is this: except in the passage last quoted, where the divergency is so minute that it is probably a mere accident, the readings given by V are always the true, or at any rate the apparently true readings; and this is no slight indication that the scribe of V adopted them as I have suggested, with the deliberate intention of improving his text. In short I can hardly doubt that the fact is as I say; but since from the nature of the case no proof is possible I have refrained throughout the treatise from employing any of these passages to support my arguments.

The vulgar manuscripts.

I shall here defend the thesis that all the known MSS of Propertius except NAFDVfv are worthless. So far as most of them are concerned this assertion is not denied, or at any rate no attempt is made to oppose it by evidence or argument. But some have had their champions; and it is the claims of these that I now essay to controvert.

First comes the codex *Groninganus* and its chief defenders Mr Luetjohann and Mr Heydenreich. I should observe that these scholars published their defences of this MS before the year 1880, and that possibly they now agree with me that it has been superseded by Baehrens' MSS, just as I agree with them that it had some value while Baehrens' MSS were yet unknown.

The following are the lections adduced as witnesses to the independent value of G by Mr Heydenreich, quaestiones Propertianae pp. 38 sq., from the first three books, and by Mr Luetjohann, commentationes Propertianae p. 6, from the fourth. I pass them singly in review.

I iii 27—29.

et quotiens raro *duxit* suspiria motu
obstipui uano credulus auspicio,
ne qua tibi insolitos portarent uisa timores.

duxti G. Easily explicable as a conjecture.

I viii 21, 22.

nam me non ullae poterunt corrumpere, *de te*
quin ego, uita, tuo limine uerba querar.

taedae G. Probably wrong; certainly unnecessary.

I xvi 23, 24.

me mediae noctes, me sidera *plena* iacentem,
frigidaque Eoo me dolet aura gelu.

prona G. A good, but not a difficult conjecture.

I xix 5. non adeo leuiter *noster* puer haesit ocellis.

nostris G. Given also by v.

II xii 18. si *puer* est alio traice *puella tuo.*

pudor...tela tua G. *pudor* and *tela* are also given by v; *tua*, I have above[1] attempted to shew, is wrong.

II xv 47. *nec* certe merito poterunt laudare minores.

haec G. Given also by f.

II xvi 18. et iubet ex *ipso* tollere dona Tyro.

ipsa G. An obvious emendation.

II xvi 33, 34.

tot iam abiere dies, cum me nec cura theatri
nec tetigit Campi, nec mea *mensa* iuuat.

musa G. Explicable as a conjecture.

[1] pp. 111 sq.

II xxi 11, 12.

Colchida sic hospes quondam decepit Iason,
eiecta est *tenuis* namque Creusa *domo*.

tenuit...domum G. This reading, if right, is an easy conjecture; but it is probably wrong. That Propertius wrote

eiecit Aesonia namque Creusa domo

is in my opinion established by the following imitations: Ovid her. XII 134 'ausus es, *Aesonia*, dicere, cede *domo*', XVI 229 sq. 'omnia Medeae fallax promisit Iason: | pulsa est *Aesonia* num minus illa *domo*?', ars III 33 sq. 'Phasida, iam matrem, fallax dimisit Iaso: | uenit in *Aesonios* altera nupta *sinus*': compare also Prop. III xi 12 'iret ut *Aesonias* aurea lana *domos*', I vi 4 'ulteriusque *domo* uadere *Memnonia*', II iii 54 'nox *Amythaonia* nupta futura *domo*'. The classical but unfamiliar *eiĕcit* (= *eicit*) was naturally misapprehended by the scribe.

II xxii 45—50.

hic unus dolor est ex omnibus acer amanti,
speranti subito si qua uenire negat.
quanta illum toto uersant suspiria lecto,
cum recipi *quae* non nouerit *illa uetat*,
et rursus puerum quaerendo audita fatigat,
quem, quae scire timet, prodere furta iubet.

quem...ille putat G. This reading (*ille* is given also by FN) is adopted by most modern editors and makes very good sense:

cum recipi, *quem* non nouerit, ille *putat*.

Certain however it cannot be called; and it may quite well be conjectural.

II xxviii 9, 10.

num sibi collatam doluit Venus? *illa peraeque*
prae se formosis inuidiosa dea est.

ipsa paremque G. I have already[1] discussed this passage and endeavoured to shew that *illa peraeque*, accepted by the latest editors Palmer and Vahlen, is the true reading. *paremque* is given by F as well as G.

[1] vol. XXI p. 131.

II xxxiv 33. nam *rursus* licet Aetoli referas Acheloi.

cursus G. An easy conjecture.

II xxxiv 59—62.

me iuuet hesternis positum languere corollis,
quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus;
Actia *Virgilio* custodis litora Phoebi
Caesaris et fortes dicere posse rates.

Virgilium G. A very obvious conjecture, and probably wrong: it seems more scientific to retain the dative *Vergilio* in v. 61 and write *mi lubet...posito* in v. 59: when *mi lubet* was corrupted to *me iuuet* the scribe changed the adjacent *posito* into the accusative but forgot to alter the distant *Vergilio*, which survives to indicate the truth.

III v 47. exitus hic uitae *superest* mihi.

superet G. Explicable as a conjecture.

III xii 35. ueteres arcus *lecto* renouasse procorum.

leto G. An obvious conjecture.

III xv 3. ut mihi praetexti pudor est uelatus *amicus*.

amictus G. Given also by DV.

III xvii 11, 12.

semper enim uacuos nox sobria torquet amantes
spesque timorque *animo* uersat *utroque modo*.

animum...utrinque meum G. Explicable as a conjecture, and a bad conjecture: *meum* impairs the sense. The text can be emended by the simple substitution of *e* for *o*:

spesque timorque *animae* uersat utroque modo,

'hope and fear toss them to and fro like a wind': 'utroque' is the adverb (Ovid rem. 443 'secta bipertito cum mens discurrit utroque'), and 'animae modo' = 'aurae ritu' (Ovid am. III 4 14 'fulminis ire modo').

III xvii 30. *cingit* Bassaricas Lydia mitra comas.

cinget G. Given also by v.

III xxii 5, 6.

si te forte iuuant Helles Athamantidos urbes,
et desiderio, Tulle, mouere meo.

nec G. Explicable as a conjecture.

IV i 36. hac ubi Fidenas longa erat *isse* uia.

ire G. Given also by FDV.

IV ii 3. Tuscus *ego* Tuscis orior.

ego et G. An obvious metrical emendation: thus other of the inferior MSS insert *a*.

IV ii 58. haec spatiis ultima *creta* meis.

meta G. An obvious conjecture, but unnecessary and probably wrong: *creta* is defended by Plin. h. n. VIII 42 65 § 160 'peracto legitimo cursu ad cretam stetere'.

IV v 19, 20.

exorabat opus uerbis ceu blanda *perure*
saxosamque ferat sedula culpa uiam.

'*pererrat* G' says Mr Luetjohann. G does not give *pererrat*, which moreover is an absurd reading: it gives *perurat*, which is given also by v.

IV vi 65, 66.

haec *summa aeternis* queritur liuere catenis
bracchia nec meritas frigida saxa manus.

sua maternis G. A most elegant emendation, but not hard to find for anyone who was acquainted with the well known story of Andromeda. G apparently belongs to the latter half of the 15th century and was written in Italy, which by that date contained many scholars quite capable of the correction.

IV viii 68, 69.

Lygdamus, ad plutei fulcra sinistra latens,
eruitur, geniumque meum *protractus* adorat.

prostratus G. Again a good emendation. Mr Luetjohann argues that this can hardly be a conjecture, because there was no necessity for altering the text; but Italian MSS of this

date are replete with unnecessary alterations, some wrong, some right.

IV viii 77, 78.

colla caue inflectas ad summum obliqua theatrum,
aut lectica tuae *sudet* aperta morae.

'*sudet* G, *sidet* N; ubi e G scriptura Kochius in symb. ph. B. p. 328 haud improbabiliter enucleauit *nudet operta*' writes Mr Luetjohann. He is mistaken: *sudet* is given by N, and by FDV into the bargain.

IV ix 21. dixerat; at sicco *torquet* sitis ora palato.

torret G. The alteration is not only unnecessary but detrimental: extreme thirst, as is well known, distorts the mouth into a grin.

IV ix 22. terraque non ullas *feta* ministrat aquas.

festa G, whence Mr Luetjohann would read *tosta* with Keil. It is true that *feta* is obscure and *tosta* appropriate; but the emendation is quite uncertain, and no editor has yet adopted it.

IV ix 38. Alciden terra *suscepta* uocat.

recepta G. Given also by FDV.

To these examples I add one more, put forward by Mr Ellis p. 393: II iii 21, 22.

et sua cum antiquae committit scripta Corinnae
carminaque *quiuis* non putat aequa suis.

lyrnes G, whence Volscus conjectured *Erinnes*. Admitting for the sake of argument that the conjecture is right, I remark that G displays no peculiar merit, since v gives *lyrines* which is nearer yet.

We see then that the proofs of G's sincerity adduced by its defenders are ineffectual. They fall into three classes: readings which are false; readings which are explicable as conjectures; and readings which are given not only by G but by one or other of the witnesses NAFDVfv. Is it asked, Why may not G, in respect of the readings which it shares with NAFDVfv, be just as sincere as are NAFDVfv in respect of the readings

which they share with G? the answer is ready to hand in the simple fact that, while NAFDVfv give scores of sincere readings which are not in G, G gives no sincere reading which is not in one or other of NAFDVfv. This fact of course has only one explanation: G is derived from these MSS, or from some of them or from one of them, and possesses no genuine element drawn from any other source. The particular MS from which G does in point of fact derive the greater number of its readings is V corrected by v, as has been already observed by Baehrens prolegg. p. x.

Next I come to the *Cuiacianus* or *Perusinus*, perhaps the worst MS of Propertius in the world. It was written at Perugia in 1467, came into the possession of Cujas, was lent by him to Scaliger, exerted a deleterious influence on Scaliger's recension, and then disappeared from sight: for some two hundred and fifty years it remained 'inrepertum et sic melius situm', till in 1874 Mr Palmer had the ill luck to discover it in the library of a friend. The following are the passages, few enough, in which he has accepted its readings or built conjectures on them.

I xx 52. formosum nymphis credere *uisus* Hylam.

rursus P in marg., whence Mr Palmer elicits the admirable emendation which I have accepted in my previous discussion of the passage[1]: *ni uis perdere rursus*. But *rursus* is given also by v.

II vi 20. nutritus *duro*, Romule, lacte lupae.

durae P. Given also by F.

II xiii 55, 56.

illis formosum *iacuisse* paludibus, illuc
diceris effusa tu, Venus, isse coma.

lauisse P. Explicable as a conjecture and accepted by no modern editor but Mr Palmer.

II xiv 15, 16.

atque utinam non tam sero mihi nota fuisset
condicio! *cineri* nunc medicina datur.

[1] pp. 105 sq.

emeriti P, whence Mr Palmer proposes '*emerito cineri* nunc' cet., an alteration which deprives the hexameter of all relevant sense. The reading of P is due to the fact that *cineri* and *emeri* are palaeographically almost identical.

II xxxii 45.

haec eadem ante *illam* inpune et Lesbia fecit.

illam iam P. An obvious and perhaps unnecessary conjecture. The MSS offer two more examples, II xv 1 and III vii 49, of hiatus at the caesura.

II xxxiii 11, 12.

a quotiens quernis laesisti frondibus ora,
mansisti stabulis *abdita* pasta tuis.

abbita P, whence Mr Palmer brilliantly recovers the truth: '*mandisti* et stabulis *arbita* pasta tuis'. I have fully admitted above[1] that *abbita* is a most extraordinary freak and has all the tokens of sincerity if considered in itself. But a freak and no more we are in reason bound to deem it, when we find it absolutely alone in a wilderness of depravity.

IV iii 11, 12.

haecne marita fides et pactae *iam* mihi noctes,
cum rudis urgenti bracchia uicta dedi.

This reading of P is accepted by Mr Palmer. If there is anything in my discussion of the passage above[2], the sense is unsatisfactory; nor are the variations *hae sunt pactae mihi* and *et parce auia* easily deduced from this original.

IV xi 21, 22.

assideant, fratrem iuxta Minoia *sella, et*
Eumenidum intento turba seuera foro.

So Mr Palmer, taking *sella et* from P. It is given also by V, and is wrong: *et* is placed at the end of an hexameter by the satiric poets alone (Lachmann on Lucr. II 502).

In these passages only has even Mr Palmer assigned any weight to the readings of the Perusinus. The Perusinus then is judged.

[1] vol. XXI pp. 111 sq. [2] vol. XXI pp. 148 sq.

The only other MS specifically patronised by any writer since Baehrens is the *Hamburgensis*: its patron is Mr Plessis, whose words I transcribe because such things must be seen to be believed: they occur on p. 41 of his études critiques sur Properce.

'Je trouve que le Hamburgensis n'est guère inférieur aux manuscrits de M. Baehrens et que Hertzberg n'avait pas tort de l'admettre dans sa récension. M. Baehrens lui-même accorde au Hamburgensis une mention honorable. Il dit que, parmi les manuscrits contenant Catulle et Tibulle avec Properce, c'est le seul qui mérite d'être cité [what Baehrens says is 'fortasse memorari meretur'] parce qu'il est transcrit d'après F ayant, il est vrai, déjà souffert des corrections. Cette dernière circonstance diminue la valeur du Hamburgensis aux yeux de M. Baehrens, qui n'en relève les variantes que de loin en loin avec celles d'autres manuscrits interpolés, sous le signe commun ς; d'après l'opinion de M. Léo et la mienne sur AFDV, le copiste de H a, au contraire, bien fait de tenir compte des corrections de F.'

Mr Plessis therefore admits that the Hamburgensis is copied from F, and yet would have us receive it into our apparatus criticus.

It remains only to notice the assertion of Mr Leo, p. 447, where after extolling N as the mainstay of Propertian criticism he proceeds 'librarii errores arguere ualebit e melioribus uulgaris notae libris quicumque eligetur. uerum AFDV omnino nihil ualent'. We have just tried and condemned the only three among the vulgar MSS which have been selected by any recent critic. When Mr Leo specifies his selections it will be possible to examine their merits: till then it must suffice to say that I have scrutinised the mass of critical material collected by Burmann and Hertzberg without discovering a fragment of genuine tradition unknown to us from NAFDVfv[1].

[1] This is the place to speak as I promised, vol. XXI p. 101, of the MSS to which Mr Hosius has called attention since this treatise was written. A collation of his Neapolitanus 268 has been obtained by Dr Postgate, who has been kind enough to inform me of its readings in a number of passages which I selected as tests. Mr Hosius' estimate seems altogether correct: the MS is one from which we shall get nothing new: at the utmost it may help to settle the tradition of the family AF when A is absent and

Conclusion.

I hope that I have now made good the promises with which I set out. It has been demonstrated, against Baehrens, that N contains a genuine element which AFDV do not contain[1], and it has been demonstrated, against Messrs Solbisky Plessis and Weber, that this genuine element in N is not derived from the archetype of AFDV but from an independent source[2] whence f and v have also derived a genuine element not possessed by AFDV[3]. It has further been shewn that N contains a second element drawn from a MS of the family AF, and a third and smaller element drawn from a MS of the family DV[4]. It has been demonstrated, against Mr Leo, that AFDV contain a genuine element which N does not contain[5], and it has been demonstrated, against Mr Solbisky, that the two families AF and DV deserve equal credence as witnesses to the reading of their archetype O[6]. It has been shewn also that each one of the four codices AFDV preserves fragments of truth peculiar to itself[7].

It is proved therefore that the cardinal MSS are related to one another as I asserted in my second thesis. Hence follows as a necessary consequence the truth of my first thesis: that the seven authorities NAFDVfv are independent witnesses and must all be employed if we would reconstruct the Propertian archetype.

F dissents from N. The same may be said of another new MS, Holkhamicus 333, an account of which was read by Dr Postgate before the Cambridge Philological Society on May 11. I expect more from Mr Hosius' Vrbinas 641 and from a closely similar Paris codex, the Memmianus of Passerat, my knowledge of which I owe to Dr Postgate. These two MSS are akin to N and on the whole decidedly inferior to it; but I think it possible that they here and there preserve the Z element even better. I base this opinion chiefly on the *Tarpeiius* quoted from both at IV i 7: another example will be their *seloni* at IV i 31 if my conjecture *seueri* is true.

[1] vol. XXI pp. 110 sqq.
[2] vol. XXI pp. 135—138.
[3] pp. 105—115.
[4] pp. 95—98.
[5] vol. XXI pp. 149 sqq.
[6] vol. XXI pp. 168 sqq.
[7] pp. 99—105.

Finally it has been shewn that the residue of the MSS exhibit no element of genuine tradition not possessed by one or other of these[1], whence it follows that they are derived from these, and are therefore to be cast aside.

I add a few remarks on certain matters connected with our subject.

In my stemma codicum, following the accepted practice, I have expressed the threefold origin of N in the simplest form by three lines converging on that MS from its three sources. I am not however to be understood as implying that N was copied directly from these: that indeed I think incredible: but since it is impossible to say how many steps separate N from each of its ancestors, any more detailed scheme would be purely conjectural and almost certainly wrong. Here however I will indicate one method by which the text of N may have been formed. Let us imagine a codex α of the family AF: there comes a scribe who employs this as his exemplar but has also at hand a codex β of the family DV to which he turns for help when α puzzles him: thus equipped he executes a copy which we will call γ. The owner of γ lights upon the codex Z which has an unmistakable air of high antiquity, and he reverentially copies thence a great number of readings into his own codex γ, just as v has copied a great number of them into V. Then comes a scribe who employs γ as his exemplar and, in transcribing it, incorporates in his copy the readings of Z appearing in the margin, which he takes to be meant for corrections, just as the Groninganus, in transcribing V, has incorporated many of the readings of v. The copy thus formed is our N. All this is a mere flight of the imagination; but my aim is to leave nothing obscure, and to shew that, although we cannot trace how the confluence into N of the three streams of tradition actually came to pass, that confluence itself is a matter of no difficulty.

It will be observed that in discussing the merits and the faults of N I have eschewed all reference to the vexed question

[1] pp. 116—124.

of its date. This I have done for two reasons. First, the date of N, being still in dispute, cannot legitimately be made the foundation of an argument. Secondly, the date of N is immaterial to our estimate of its worth. If it were proved to belong, as Messrs Keil and Plessis contend, to the 12th century, that would indeed confute Baehrens' estimate of it; but then I think I have confuted Baehrens' estimate already without this help. If on the other hand it were proved to be written, as Baehrens contends, later than 1430, that fact would not one whit discredit the proofs of its sincerity amassed in these pages, because those proofs are intrinsic. I myself however incline, I confess, to suspect that N is not earlier than the 15th century, for the following reason. Mr Lucian Mueller praef. p. IX, while conceding that its handwriting in some respects though not in all resembles that of the 12th or even the 11th century, has the words 'quid quod ipsae membranae saeculum XV potius quam XIII referre uidebantur?'; and Baehrens too prolegg. p. VIII says 'certe ipsae cartae non priores saeculo XV'. Now this statement, true or false, has never been contradicted. Mr Plessis devotes a whole chapter, pp. 6—18, to this MS: he has much to say on the antique aspect of its writing; but not by one word does he so much as attempt to refute the assertion that the parchment on which it is written is of the 15th century. If then I give, as I am bound to give, equal credence to the two parties in the dispute, I must deem the date assigned to N by Mueller and Baehrens the more probable; since it seems easier for a man living in the 15th century to imitate the writing of the 12th than for a man living in the 12th to imitate the writing materials of the 15th.

Which is the best MS of Propertius? There is no best MS of Propertius. But if we were compelled to choose two MSS, and to construct our text from them alone, the choice would be easy: they should be N and D, because they best supply one another's defects. D is not only the best representative of the family DV but it is the best representative of O; for, though the family AF is quite equal to the family DV, neither A nor F

represents its family so well as D represents the other, since A is mutilated and F is carelessly written by an illiterate man. N on the other hand, exceedingly untrustworthy as a representative of O, contains a large element of truth derived from Z to which D had no access, and moreover has drawn even from O, through the family AF, a great deal which serves to supplement the testimony of D. Possessing these two MSS we should still lack many true readings of the family AF which F alone preserves, and many true readings from Z presented only by f or v; but no other two MSS would leave us lacking so little.

To conclude: I design this treatise for a defence of eclecticism, but of eclecticism within scientific bounds. The student of an ancient text has two enemies. There is the devotee of system who prefers simplicity to truth, and who having half learnt from Madvig and Bekker the great lesson of our century, *magnam et inconditam testium turbam ad paucos et certos esse redigendam, a quibus ceteri rem acceperint*, selects his few witnesses without ascertaining if they were really the informants of the rest, constructs a neat apparatus at whatever cost to the text of his hapless author, and seeks to overawe the timid by sonorous talk about 'sanae artis praecepta omnia'; and there is the born hater of science who ransacks Europe for waste paper that he may fill his pages to half their height with the lees of the Italian renascence, and then by appeals to the reader's superstition would persuade him to hope without reason and against likelihood that he will gather grapes of thorns and figs of thistles. Here is my attempt to fortify against delusion on either hand the student of at least one Latin author.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE CORINTHIAN WAR.

The dates for the beginning and end of the Corinthian War are well established, the first by the [1]eclipse of August 14, 394, the second by the [2]consensus of evidence that the Peace of Antalcidas, which ended the war, was concluded in the archonship of Theodotus, July 387—July 386. The eclipse fixes first the date of the outbreak of the war in the preceding year, in which [3]campaign Lysander was slain at Haliartus: and secondly the dates of the sea-fight at Cnidus, a few days before the eclipse; of the battle of Coronea a short time after the eclipse; and also of the battle of Corinth, which was fought a few weeks earlier, about the end of the [4]archonship of Diophantus, June 394. The chronology of the subsequent events has been much disputed owing to the vagueness of the marks of time given by Xenophon and the palpable mistakes of Diodorus: a difference indeed of as much as two years appears in the various arrangements, advocated by different chronologists, some placing the destruction of the Spartan *mora* by Iphicrates in 392, others in 390, according as they date the biennial Isthmian games mentioned by [5]Xenophon. Grote's view, which adopts the later year, seems on the whole to be the more probable, and to have the support of what little additional evidence has been collected since his time.

The prime difficulty is due to the fact that Xenophon has chosen to narrate the events of the war by land and by sea in

[1] Xen. Hell. iv. 3. 10. Further references to Xen. Hell. are denoted by the number of the book, chapter, and section only. Lysias, Arist. 28.

[2] Aristides ii. 370. Diodorus xiv. Polyb. i. 6.

[3] iii. 5. 19.

[4] Aristides ii. 370.

[5] iv. 5. 1.

two wholly distinct sections, which only cross each other certainly [1]at one point and doubtfully at another, and out of neither case can much help be derived towards fixing the chronology. The events of the land-war he narrates uninterruptedly from iv. 4. 1, when Agesilaus at the end of the campaign of 394 B.C. disbanded his army, to iv. 7. 7, where he recounts an expedition of Agesipolis against Argos. Then from iv. 8. 1 to v. 1. 35 he professes to relate *πάντα...τὰ κατὰ θάλατταν καὶ τὰς πρὸς θαλάττῃ πόλεις γενόμενα*—all the events that happened by sea during the same period of time, under the limitation, however, that he treats only of *τῶν πράξεων τὰς ἀξιομνημονεύτους*. The problem is therefore so to combine these two sections and harmonize them with the scattered statements of other authorities, as to evolve a tolerably self-consistent scheme of chronology.

At the end of the campaign of 394 B.C., [2]Agesilaus, we are told, disbanded his army and sailed home; and [3]Conon, while blockading the Hellespont, collected ships for the ensuing campaign. Accordingly next spring (393) Conon and Pharnabazus sailed across the Aegean, made various descents upon the Peloponnesian coast, captured Cythera, and sailed to the Isthmus of Corinth, where they found a number of allies assembled to prosecute the war with Sparta. [4]Pharnabazus urged them to act vigorously, leaving with them at the same time a considerable sum of money, and then sailed homewards. On the way, however, Conon persuaded him to allow him to stay with the fleet at Athens, and to provide him with money for the purpose of rebuilding the Long Walls and the fortifications of Piræus. Thus was Conon enabled to do this great service to his country. That all these events, including at least the beginning of the rebuilding of the Long Walls, must have taken place before July 393, is proved by an [5]inscription recently discovered at Athens, which records the hiring of artizans by Conon for this

[1] iv. 4. 19: iv. 8. 23. Teleutias' twelve ships.

[2] iv. 4. 1. This happened some time after the Pythian games (September): cf. iv. 3. 21 with Plut. Agesil. 19.

[3] iv. 8. 7.

[4] iv. 8. 8.

[5] CIA. ii. 830. Köhler, Mitth. d. d. Archäo. Instit. in Athen, iii. 1878, p. 50, and Wachsmuth, Königl. sächsisch. Gesell. 1887, p. 372.

purpose in the archonship of Eubulides, July 394 to July 393. With the Persian gold the [1]Corinthians also found the means to equip a fleet, with which they gained the mastery over the Corinthian Gulf and maintained it, notwithstanding the efforts of the Lacedæmonians to dispossess them, until Teleutias (apparently in the following year 392/391) succeeded to the command of the Lacedæmonian ships and asserted once more the Lacedæmonian supremacy.

So far all is clear: now comes the first difficulty. Are the dissensions and battles at Corinth narrated by Xenophon in iv. 4 to be put *before* or *after* the visit of Conon and Pharnabazus? [2]Grote argues with great force that they are to be put afterwards. He maintains that on the first outbreak of the war in 395, [3]when they received money from Tithraustes, and again, in 393, when they received money from Pharnabazus, the Corinthians were zealous in carrying on the war and had no reasons for discontent; whereas the discontents spoken of in iv. 4. 1 could only have arisen from causes, which "took effect after a long continuance—the hardships of the land-wars, the losses of property and slaves, the jealousy towards Attica and Bœotia as being undisturbed, &c." At least the summer of 393 must therefore be allowed, wherein the ravages complained of may have taken place; so that, if [4]Kirchner's conjecture as to the date of the [5]Euclea, based upon the analogy of the Corcyræan Calendar, be accepted, the massacre of the oligarchs must have happened about February 392. Then Praxitas gained his victory within the walls of Corinth in the summer of the same year, and at the end of the campaign large armaments [6]were given up on both sides, and the contending parties henceforward limited themselves to harassing each other with mercenary forces stationed at Corinth and Sicyon respectively. In the same year may be placed the [7]exploits of Iphicrates' peltasts at Phlius and in Arcadia, and the rebuilding

[1] iv. 8. 10, 11.

[2] ix. 152.

[3] iii. 5. 1.

[4] De Andocidis quæ fertur tertiâ oratione, p. 10. Could more reliance be placed on this conjecture, it would be a still stronger confirmation of Grote's view.

[5] iv. 4. 2.

[6] iv. 4. 14.

[7] iv. 4. 15—18.

of the Long Walls of Corinth with the help of the Athenians. Agesilaus' first invasion of Argos, the event next [1]recorded by Xenophon, thus falls naturally at the opening of the campaign of 391—a date confirmed by [2]Andocides, who apparently in the winter of 392—391 speaks of the war as having continued four years (i.e. 395—392) and of the Argolis being as yet unravaged. It is to be noted that Diodorus (xiv. 97) also speaks of an invasion of the Argolis by Agesilaus in the archonship of Nicoteles 391/390; but he represents Agesilaus as returning immediately to Sparta, instead of marching onwards, as Xenophon relates, to the Isthmus, so that not too much stress must be laid upon this coincidence. The invasion of the Argolis was followed by the capture of Lechæum through the [3]joint action of Agesilaus and Teleutias. This brings us [4]next

[1] iv. 4. 19.

[2] cf. De Pace §§ 18—20. It seems impossible to make Andocides quite consistent with Xenophon. He speaks of three Peloponnesian victories, and by the third over 'Αργείους μὲν ἅπαντας καὶ Κορινθίους, ἡμῶν δὲ καὶ Βοιωτῶν τοὺς παρόντας (cf. Xen. Hell. iv. 4. 9) he evidently means Praxitas' victory within the Long Walls of Corinth. If Xenophon be right, then Andocides must be wrong in stating that the Lacedæmonians at the same time captured Lechæum—a pardonable exaggeration in an orator, especially when we remember what Xenophon tells us, that many of the Bœotian guards within the town were slain upon the walls and upon the roofs of the docks. Andocides goes on to say that, now that the war had lasted four years (395—392), the Bœotians were on the point of making peace, agreeing to leave Orchomenos independent, though this had been their original subject of dispute with Sparta; whereas the Argives, secured by their πατρία and ἰδία εἰρήνη from all ravaging of their country (i.e. before Agesilaus' invasion in 391), were eager for the war to continue. At this moment the Athenians were (§ 12) already in possession of Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros, and according to Andocides the Lacedæmonians were now ready to admit their claims to these possessions; whereas Antalcidas' proposals (Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 12—15), that the Athenians should recognize their independence, had resulted in the complete breakdown of his negotiations. This implies that Antalcidas' scheme was earlier in date (perhaps the summer of 392) than the proposed peace advocated by Andocides; and that both the Athenians and the Spartans in the interval had seen some additional reasons for wishing for peace. These may well be found, on the part of the Athenians, in the loss of Conon's services owing to his arrest by Tiribazus, and on the part of the Spartans in the breakdown of Antalcidas' negotiations and consequent fear of Persia.

[3] iv. 4. 19 and iv. 8. 11.

[4] iv. 5. 1.

(ἐκ τούτου) to Agesilaus' expedition against Corinth at the time of the [1]Isthmian Games (c. April 390), shortly after which occurred the destruction of the Spartan *mora* by Iphicrates at the time of the Hyacinthian Festival (midsummer). This latter date is indirectly confirmed by the passage already referred to in Andocides De Pace (§ 37), where the orator states that though the war has continued four years, the Spartans had as yet suffered no reverse by land—a statement which would have been quite impossible after this victory of Iphicrates.

It is natural to suppose that Agesilaus' campaign against the Acarnanians, which [2]Xenophon next relates, belongs to the following year, though there is no reason, except its order in his narrative, why it should not be put a year later, i.e. 388: for the only marks of time that the historian gives (§ 12 τὸ μετόπωρον and 7 § 1 παρελθόντος τοῦ χειμῶνος) do nothing towards fixing the year. Similarly Agesilaus' invasion of the Argolis, which happened [3]ἐκ τούτου, may be equally well assigned to 388 or 387.

So much for the chronology of the events by land.

The chronology of the events by sea is still more difficult owing to the fact already mentioned, that Xenophon only professes to make a selection of the most important events (iv. 8. 1—v. 1. 35). How far he has narrated them in chronological order, and how far he has grouped them together for purposes of convenience in narrating, is in many cases impossible to discover. Little help can be gained from other sources. Diodorus gives practically none: his unreliability is abundantly evident from two palpable mistakes that he makes in the course of this period (not to mention others); (*a*) Diphridas, [4]he says in contradiction to Xenophon, commanded in Asia *before* and not *after* Thibron: (*b*) he leaves, obviously by accident, a whole year blank between [5]Thrasybulus' setting out to the Hellespont and his death at Aspendus. Fortunately Polybius

[1] If this expedition be referred (with Clinton, Dodwell, Breitenbach, &c.) to 392, then all the events hitherto spoken of have to be crowded into the single year 393 instead of being spread over the three years 393—391.

[2] iv. 6. 1—14.

[3] iv. 7. 2.

[4] xiv. 97—99. cf. Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 21.

[5] xiv. 94—99.

(and his statement is confirmed by Aristides ii. 370) fixes with certainty the Peace of Antalcidas to the year 387/386. Only two inscriptions throw any light upon the question. The first (CIA. ii. 830) confirms the date already assumed, for Conon's rebuilding of the Athenian Long Walls (393 spring or summer): the second (CIA. ii. Add. 14 b) is thought to prove that the final acceptance of the Peace of Antalcidas must be put some months later than the date assigned by Clinton; for the inscription shows that Athens was still endeavouring in the archonship of Theodotus (387/386) to strengthen her influence in Clazomenæ. This, it is rightly [1]argued, would have been impossible after the acceptance of the Peace, which must therefore be dated, not at the beginning, but nearer the middle of Theodotus' archonship.

Beyond these scanty materials no further help from ancient sources seems to be available, so that we are apparently reduced with Clinton and Grote to sprinkling the recorded events over the years 393—387 in accordance with their inherent probability.

Of late years, however, Beloch in an appendix to his 'Die Attische Politik seit Perikles' (1884) has very ingeniously tried to construct an annual table of the events, based upon the list of the Spartan admirals, which he has pieced together out of the casual notices in the Hellenica. This list leads to many striking coincidences, which in many cases tend to confirm it; but it involves two or three preliminary assumptions, which under the circumstances are hardly capable of proof. The first assumption is that the admiralty at Sparta was an annual office; the second, that the newly elected admiral entered upon his office about midsummer. For both these assumptions there is a considerable amount of evidence, which Beloch has collected in two articles, the one in the Rheinisches Museum, 34 (1879), the other in Philologus 43 (1884). The third assumption is that the seven names thus collected, Podanemus and his temporary successors Teleutias, Ecdicus, Teleutias, Hierax, Antalcidas, Teleutias—furnish an exhaustive list; and the fourth, that Teleutias, whatever may have been his title,

[1] cf. Swoboda and Köhler, Mitth. d. deutsch. Arch. Instit. vii. 1882.

practically filled the office for three years, notwithstanding the law mentioned in Hell. ii. 1. 7 that the same man could not be admiral more than once. In 406—405, however, the Spartans, Beloch reminds us, evaded this law by making Lysander secretary, instead of admiral, Aracus being merely the nominal commander-in-chief, and next year Lysander again appears as the *de facto* commander-in-chief of the fleet, whatever may have been his title. Similarly, therefore, though in the course of the Corinthian War Teleutias appears on three separate occasions as the commander of the Spartan fleet, it is noticeable that the title of *ναύαρχος* is only actually applied to him by [1]Xenophon on the third and last. Of Teleutias' several commands something will be said hereafter, but under these assumptions, which in several points, as will appear, are incidentally confirmed, the various dates in the maritime war can be fixed with some degree of apparent accuracy. The method might indeed be extended with advantage to the Athenian generals mentioned in the period, who in the regular course of things, entered upon office about midsummer also (i.e. 1 of Hecatombæon). In their case however there is the further difficulty, that they were ten in number and often re-elected in successive years. Still on one or two occasions this date of their entrance upon office enters as a factor into the problem.

How then does Beloch arrive at his list of Spartan admirals? In Hell. iv. 8. 11 we are told that Podanemus was put in command of a fleet to counteract the Corinthian fleet, which had been equipped with the gold of Pharnabazus in 393 B.C. This cannot have occurred till after midsummer, so that Podanemus' year of office must have been 393 392. Podanemus was however slain, and succeeded first by his secretary Pollis, who, being wounded, was in his turn succeeded by Herippidas. If then we suppose, that at midsummer Teleutias replaced Herippidas in the ordinary way, although Xenophon does not on this occasion call him *ναύαρχος*, we then get an important synchronism between the series of events by sea and land. For this would make Teleutias' year to have been 392 391, and it appears from the dates for the war by land already arrived at, that it

[1] v. 1. 13.

was in the spring of 391 that Teleutias captured the docks of Lechæum on the same day that his brother Agesilaus re-took the Long Walls of Corinth (Hell. iv. 4. 19).

Xenophon nowhere says that Ecdicus (iv. 8. 20) was Teleutias' immediate successor. Can it be proved that he was? Beloch thinks that it can be by reckoning backwards from Antalcidas, whose year can be fixed with something like certainty to 388/387. For the Peace negotiated by him cannot for the reasons alleged by Clinton (F. H. *sub anno*) be put very late in the archonship of Theodotus, nor yet very early, as appears from the inscription about Clazomenæ already alluded to (CIA. 14 b). Further it appears from Xenophon's narrative that the negotiations were carried on by Antalcidas during his year of office. Out of that time his journey to Susa and back, and his business there, cannot have occupied less than six months, and he appears in active command of his fleet both before and after his journey. On his return to the coast of the Aegean he found a contingent of Syracusan and Italian ships ready to help him, which, under the conditions of ancient navigation, cannot have reached the Hellespont before May. He then captured eight Athenian ships, and further collected a fleet of eighty ships, with which he obtained so complete a command over the Hellespont that the Athenians in alarm became once more eager for peace. Finally a congress of Greek deputies met (probably at Sardis) to consider the terms offered by the King of Persia, and after this some considerable interval must have elapsed between this congress and the final acceptance of the Peace by the various Greek states about Nov. 387. All these proceedings must have required many months, so that, as Antalcidas seems to have undertaken his journey to Susa shortly after he entered upon his office, his year of command must, beyond all reasonable doubt, have been 388/387. His immediate predecessor was the admiral Hierax (v. 1. 3, 6), whose secretary was Gorgopas, and whose year must evidently have been 389/388. In that passage Xenophon relates with some detail under what circumstances Hierax took over the fleet from Teleutias; and in the previous chapter (iv. 8. 23) how Teleutias had in his turn succeeded or rather perhaps

superseded the admiral Ecdicus. It seems therefore legitimate to infer that Teleutias must at any rate, whether he was entitled *ναύαρχος* or not, have held the ordinary year's command 390/389; while, if he superseded Ecdicus a few months after the latter's appointment, as an attempt will be made to show, he must then have been *de facto* commander-in-chief of the Spartan fleet for more than eighteen months. This would make Ecdicus' year of office to be 391/390; whence it follows from what has already been stated, that Ecdicus in his turn must have been Teleutias' immediate successor, shortly after the latter's capture of Lechæum in the early summer of 391.

The list of Spartan admirals having been thus arrived at, the remaining events of the maritime war can be arranged with comparative ease.

393/392. Podanemus, admiral; Pollis, secretary.

Certain skirmishes of which Xenophon [1]gives no details, except the death of Podanemus and the wounding of Pollis, whereupon the command was taken by Herippidas, took place this year in the Corinthian Gulf.

392/391. Teleutias, admiral(?).

A priori and on the analogy of Lysander it would be natural to suppose that Teleutias was regularly appointed admiral this year, and that afterwards owing to his distinguished services and as the brother of King Agesilaus he was on the two subsequent occasions irregularly appointed to the supreme command. In the absence of all direct evidence however this must be left as an open question.

This summer (392) Antalcidas' [2]attempt to bring about a general peace among the contending Greek states in the name of Tiribazus, the Persian satrap at Sardis, failed owing to the opposition of Athens, Thebes, and Argos.

In the autumn [3]Tiribazus, having first arrested Conon, who had come as envoy to his court to represent Athenian interests against Antalcidas, repaired to the Persian Court at Susa. After his arrival the Persian king sent down Struthas to

[1] iv. 8. 11. [2] iv. 8. 12—15. [3] iv. 8. 16, 17.

succeed him at Sardis. Some six months must be allowed for these two journeys, which brings us to the spring of 391. This spring Teleutias [1]captured the docks of Lechæum on the same day that Agesilaus after his invasion of the Argolis re-took the walls of Corinth. About the same time the Lacedæmonians, finding Struthas hostile to their interests in Asia, sent out Thibron to oppose him: but Thibron was soon defeated and slain.

391/390. Ecdicus, admiral.

The Lacedæmonians at one and the same time sent out their admiral Ecdicus to help their supporters in Rhodes, and Diphridas to collect the remains of Thibron's army and to continue the war against Struthas. Diodorus (xiv. 97), as Beloch remarks, synchronizes the invasion of the Argolis by Agesilaus (which however, as was noted above, he describes with some difference of detail as compared with Xenophon), and the expedition of Eudocimus (presumably Ecdicus?), Philodicus, and Diphridas. It is noticeable too that he records them both under the year of the archon Nicoteles 391/390. The synchronism is doubtless more reliable than the date; still they both confirm the present scheme of chronology, which puts the expedition of Agesilaus in the same natural year (391) as the admiralship of Ecdicus; for according to Diodorus' system of reckoning, which begins the year in mid-winter or early spring, 391 is the proper figure, whereby to denote the whole archonship of Nicoteles. Ecdicus, [2]Xenophon tells us, finding the enemy too strong at Rhodes remained inactive at Rhodes until his recal on the arrival of Teleutias *σὺν ταῖς δώδεκα ναυσὶν αἷς εἶχεν ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀχαίαν καὶ Λέχαιον κόλπῳ*. At this point, if we follow Beloch, we have to assume that not only Ecdicus remained inactive for the remainder of his twelve months' command at Cnidus, but that Teleutias also after his first year had remained a second year in command of these same twelve ships in the Corinthian Gulf, after his victory and the permanent occupation of Lechæum by the Lacedæmonians had rendered his further presence there unnecessary. On the other hand it might of course be argued, that, if neither of the

[1] iv. 4. 19. [2] iv. 8. 22.

two commanders had done anything of importance within the year, Xenophon would, according to the principle which he laid down for himself in iv. 8. 1, have simply skipped over the interval. Still it seems to be more consistent with Xenophon's narrative here, and, as will appear hereafter, with the exploits of Thrasybulus, who was sent out against Teleutias, and of his successors, to suppose that the Spartan government, contrasting the victorious energy of Teleutias at Lechæum in the spring with the unsuccessful inactivity of Ecdicus at Cnidus, decided to supersede the regular admiral after a few months only of his command had expired. If this hypothesis be correct, Teleutias must have sent Ecdicus home in the autumn of 391, and must have continued for some twenty months or more (just like Lysander in 405, 404 B.C.) *de facto* admiral of the Spartan fleet, whatever his title may have been. Soon after his arrival (i.e. late autumn of 391) Teleutias sailed to Rhodes and on the way [1]captured an Athenian squadron, which had been despatched under Philocrates to assist Evagoras in Cyprus. The Athenians thereupon made great exertions to counteract the activity of Sparta in the eastern Aegean, and sent a fleet of 40 vessels under Thrasybulus the Stirian to help the Rhodian democrats. Most of the winter of 391/390, we may well assume, was occupied in equipping this fleet, so that Thrasybulus probably sailed in the spring of 390. For fear of Teleutias however he directed his course to the Hellespont, where among other things he succeeded in winning over Byzantium to the Athenian side and in imposing the toll upon vessels passing through the Bosporus once more for the benefit of Athens.

390/389. Teleutias, *de facto* admiral.

[2]Diodorus, as it has already been said, chronicles these operations of Thrasybulus under the two years 392 and 390, leaving by some mistake the intervening year a blank. Now it appears from Lysias (orr. 28 and 29), Demosthenes (pp. 475 and 1302), and various inscriptions, as well as from Xenophon and Diodorus, that Thrasybulus' successes were wide and far-reaching in their results, so that his operations may well have extended over two years or rather parts of two years. Probably therefore

[1] iv. 8. 24. [2] xiv. 94, 97.

he spent the whole of the summer of 390 on the Hellespont and Bosporus, and the winter months at Lesbos, and undertook the disastrous raid upon Aspendus in which he lost his life in the spring of 389, i.e. in the latter half of the archonship of Demostratus. Diodorus, it will be noticed, also puts his death in the archonship of Demostratus, meaning thereby, however, our year 390. Still he is by no means particular under which year he arranges his events, so that the coincidence noted is some small confirmation of the present arrangement of events, especially as the date might very well have been recorded on his tomb at Athens, which Pausanias (i. 29. 3) tells us that he saw, and so have passed into the writings of Diodorus' authorities.

Beloch puts Thrasybulus' expedition a year later for two reasons: (1) because he had Teleutias opposed to him, and Teleutias in Beloch's list of Spartan admirals is for the year 390/389; and (2) because Aristophanes in the Plutus (549), which was acted in the early months of 388, says—

οὐκοῦν δήπου τῆς πτωχείας πενίαν φαμὲν εἶναι ἀδελφήν;
ὑμεῖς γ' οἵπερ καὶ Θρασυβούλῳ Διονύσιον εἶναι ὅμοιον.

—and has no allusions to the disastrous fate of the expedition. The first of Beloch's reasons has already been dealt with. The second carries but little weight, not only because the political allusions in the play are extremely scanty, but also because the verse in question, which Beloch asserts must prove that Thrasybulus was still living, seems to have just as much meaning whether he were alive or dead.

If then the spring of 389 be adopted as the date of Thrasybulus' death, the succeeding events follow in the order narrated by Xenophon: whereas Beloch, assuming the spring of 388 to be the date of his death, has to suppose that Xenophon, after in iv. 8. 31 recording the despatch of Agyrrhius, Thrasybulus' successor, goes back in v. 1. 1, without a word of explanation, to the events of 389.

389/388. Hierax, admiral; Gorgopas, secretary.

Of this year's generals the Athenians sent out [1]Agyrrhius to take the command of Thrasybulus' ships, which had retreated to Rhodes; Iphicrates, the mercenary leader (there is no need

[1] iv. 8. 31. Diod. xiv. 99.

to suppose that he had been regularly elected στρατηγός), to counteract the measures, which the Lacedæmonians were taking to undo Thrasybulus' work upon the Hellespont; and [1]Pamphilus to put a stop to the piracy of the Aeginetans. After an encounter with Pamphilus at Aegina, Teleutias was superseded by Hierax, the regular admiral for the year. [2]Hierax at once sailed to Rhodes, leaving his secretary Gorgopas behind at Aegina, who for five months besieged Pamphilus in a fortress, which the Athenians had built upon the island: whereupon the Athenians removed Pamphilus and his troops. Aristophanes in the Plutus (c. Feb. 388) has an obscure allusion to Agyrrhius (v. 176, cf. Eccles. 184), and apparently to some legal process going on against a Pamphilus (v. 174), who may very reasonably be identified with the unsuccessful general at Aegina.

388/387. Antalcidas, admiral; Nicolochus, secretary.

After their removal of Pamphilus, the Athenians began once more to suffer from the depredations of the Aeginetans; so now they equipped a new squadron under Eunomus, probably one of the new generals for the year, against them. Shortly afterwards the new Spartan admiral Antalcidas arrived at Aegina.

The remaining events of the war seem to present little chronological difficulty. Antalcidas took Gorgopas with him as escort from Aegina to Ephesus, whence he immediately sent him back again, at the same time that he despatched his secretary Nicolochus to Abydos to succeed Anaxibius, who had been defeated and slain by Iphicrates in the previous year. Gorgopas on his return voyage [3]fell in with Eunomus, drove him back to Aegina, and next day defeated him, capturing four of his ships. Shortly afterwards however he was himself defeated by Chabrias, who was on his way to Cyprus to help Evagoras. [4]Eteonicus was apparently appointed to succeed Gorgopas at Aegina. These events may all very well have occurred before or during the autumn of 388. Xenophon then goes on to say ἐκ δὲ τούτου οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι Τελευτίαν αὖ ἐκπέμπουσιν ἐπὶ ταύτας τὰς

[1] iv. 8. 31: v. 1. 1, 2.
[2] v. 1. 5.
[3] v. 1. 7—9.
[4] v. 1. 13.

ναῦς ναύαρχον. Beloch here interprets *ναύαρχος* in his usual way, and is therefore obliged to suppose that the operations of Teleutias recorded in the following sections (13—24) belong to the year 387/386, and that they are thus inserted by Xenophon out of their chronological order: for in § 25 Xenophon goes back to speak of Antalcidas, who appears to be still in his year of office (i.e. 388/387). Moreover Beloch sees a confirmation of this view in the mention (§ 23) of *ὁλκάδας γεμούσας...σίτου*, arguing that this must be the corn of the harvest of 387, which they were conveying to Athens in the autumn of that year. Surely however these merchantmen may have been just as well conveying in the spring of 387 the stored corn of the harvest of 388; indeed after that Antalcidas had regained the command of the Hellespont in the spring or early summer of 387 there could have been no corn-ships sailing round the promontory of Sunium. And as for the title of *ναύαρχος* it is much simpler to suppose with Breitenbach (cf. not. ad loc.) that the designation *ναύαρχος* is here specially limited by the addition *ἐπὶ ταύτας τὰς ναῦς*, and that the Spartans, in the year of Antalcidas, were merely once more (*αὖ*) availing themselves of the services of their hitherto only successful commander at sea. In fact a continuous reading of Xenophon's narrative, especially § 20 *ἐκεῖνος* (Teleutias) *γὰρ ἐνόμισεν ἀμελέστερον μὲν ἔχειν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους περὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ λιμένι ναυτικὸν Γοργώπα ἀπολωλότος*, seems almost to necessitate this hypothesis; whereas according to Beloch's reckoning Gorgopas' death must have occurred nearly a twelvemonth before these exploits of Teleutias.

Meantime Antalcidas, having spent some six or eight months in his negotiations with the Persian king and in his journey to and from Susa, came down again to the Aegean coast. There hearing that Nicolochus was besieged by Iphicrates at Abydos, he went by land to that city. Arrived at Abydos he collected a fleet of more than 80 ships, with which he drove Iphicrates and the other Athenian commanders out of the Hellespont, and soon reduced the Athenians at home to wish eagerly for peace. Then followed (c. May or June 387) the congress of Greek deputies, assembled under the presidency

of Tiribazus (probably at Sardis) to listen to the terms dictated to them by the Great King. The next six months must have been occupied in the return of the deputies to their respective states, the opposition raised by Thebes, Agesilaus' threatened invasion of Bœotia, the terrorizing of Corinth and Argos into submission, until at last probably about November of the same year the ἐπ' Ἀνταλκίδου εἰρήνη was finally accepted by all the Greek states.

The above scheme of chronology for the Corinthian War is put forward by the present writer with considerable diffidence. Compared with Beloch's in regard to the maritime events, it claims to be more in harmony with their order in Xenophon's narrative, and (if indeed that be any merit) to be rather more consistent with Diodorus. Again, while it recognizes the soundness in the main of Beloch's hypothesis, that the Spartan admiralship was an annual office beginning about midsummer, it recognizes at the same time the irregular nature of two at any rate of Teleutias' three commands, and does not seek by any undue straining of Xenophon's text to co-ordinate them exactly with the tenure of the ordinary admirals. This view finds too its confirmation in the parallel case of Lysander, and does not invalidate in any way Xenophon's general [1]statement of the Spartan law—*οὐ νόμος αὐτοῖς δὶς τὸν αὐτὸν ναυαρχεῖν.*

G. E. UNDERHILL.

[1] ii. 1. 7.

ON BOOK XV OF OVID'S METAMORPHOSES.

Any endeavour to enlarge our critical apparatus for the last book of Ovid's Metamorphoses deserves a welcome from scholars. The two best authorities, the Marcianus and the Neapolitanus, desert us at xiv 830 and 838 respectively, and the Laurentianus is lost from xii 298 onwards. We have to trust to the Hamburgensis or Hauniensis, h, and the Amploniensis, ϵ[1], both deeply interpolated. In the 5th part of his studies on the *Tradition and Criticism of Ovid's Metamorphoses*[2], Dr Hugo Magnus, the well-known Ovidian scholar, publishes the readings of four previously uncollated manuscripts, one at Leyden of the beginning of the 13th century, Leidensis Vossianus 51 (V), one at Graz of the 13th century, Graecensis 1415 (G), and two paper ones at Bâle of the 15th, Basileenses F v 26 (B_1) and F vi 22 (B_2).

Dr Magnus does not deceive himself about the character of these MSS. "Sie wimmeln", he says, "von Schreib- und Lesefehlern, von Missverständnissen und Interpolationen, sie sind *kläglich schlecht*—d. h. *ebenso gut wie* H(h)ϵ, auf deren Lesarten man heute den Text des 15. Buches zu gründen vorgiebt". I quite agree with his estimate of their badness. Bad as they are, however, they will have some claims upon our consideration if they preserve traces of the truth where h and ϵ have lost it. I begin with the paper MSS. B_1 and B_2 are in some relationship to each other, the exact nature of which it

[1] The readings of ϵ given in this paper are those reported by Korn, with the corrections cited by Dr Magnus from R. Grau *De Ov. Met. Cod. Amploniano priore* (Hall. 1892. Diss.).

[2] *Studien zur Ueberlieferung und Kritik der Metamorphosen Ovid's*, Programm des Sophien-Gymnasiums, Berlin 1893, 4to, pp. 29.

would probably not repay anyone to investigate. Thus in XV 848 they both end the line with 'simul alcius euolat illa', both have 'cecidit titulus' 856, 'angusti' 869, 'astra perennis | alta' 875—6. Of the two B_1 is easily the most corrupt; but B_2 appears to have no correct reading of its own. Their claims to be considered rest on the undoubtedly good reading 'eneadem' in 804, which however has been found by Mr Housman in a much older codex in the British Museum Harley 2742, saec. XIII; see the Appendix to this paper. I have observed nothing else of any value that is not preserved in older MSS. except perhaps 9 'Gratia' (for Graiia?) B_1, and 20 'Missilus' the same, but also "*manche* ς" (Magnus), which is a little nearer to 'Myscelus' than the readings of hεVG.

There is more to be said for G and V; between which also there appears to be some connexion, as may be inferred from e.g. 776 'en acui sceleratos cernitis enses': 'in mea uiscera latos enses' V, 'inlatos mea uiscera enses' G, G having transposed the 'latos'. The following readings deserve attention: XV 73 'Arcuit' GV, 80 'florem' G (m erased), 92 'ritusque' GV, 211 'sparsis per tempora canis' (sparsus V^2) V, 304 'derepta' G, 'bicorni' V, 305 'caprọ' (i perhaps from the first hand) G, 526 'partim reprehensa relinqui' GV ('partim reprensa' h and N^2). In 475 'formidatis' GV, 'formidantes' hε; in the same line 'includite' GV is either right (so Magnus) or points to 'inludite'. In 504 'damnauit meritumque nihil pater eicit urbe' 'eiecit' V (also N^2) for 'eicit' is perhaps a remnant of antiquity; cf. Lachmann Lucr. p. 128. It would explain the origin of the corruption of late MSS. which was once the vulgate and which well illustrates the growth of interpolation in the 15th book '*arguit inmeritumque* pater *proiecit ab* urbe': 'pr̃ eiecit urbe' became 'proiecit urbe', then the lost 'pater' had to be restored; the other corrections were metrical. Before leaving these MSS. I may add that V is remarkable for the number of times it omits the initial letter of each line and G for the Old German glosses which it contains.

Dr Magnus's contributions to the criticism of the book consist partly of short foot-notes appended to his collation,

and partly of suggestions supported at greater length in the last 13 pages of his dissertation. The latter I now subjoin. The lection printed last in each case is the one which he prefers. 107 'putes' h, 'potest' εGV (very likely right). 111 sqq. 'prima putatur | hostia sus meruisse mori quia semina pando | *eruerat* rostro spemque *interciderat* anni'. 'eruerat —interciderat' h 2 ς, 'eruerat—interceperat' 17 ς (eruerat—interfecerat Probus), 'eruerit ('euertit' G)—interceperit' εGV (probably right; as Magnus points out, the subjunctive is in accordance with Ovid's custom, and 'interceperit' is strongly supported by *Met.* VIII 292. It is also favoured by the phrase of the epitomator of the fables 'nam paulatim concessum est ut maleficae ferae dolis *interceptae* occiderentur et mansuetarum foetus (?) sues quod fruges satas eruerent'; compare below p. 148). 332—4 'est *lacus* Arcadiae, Pheneum dixere priores, | ambiguis suspectus aquis quas nocte timeto: | nocte nocent potae, sine noxa luce bibuntur'; lacus hεV, locus G (also $B_{1\,2}$). In a long and learned disquisition Dr Magnus shows that there is no evidence for a *lake Pheneus* (this was the name of the town) and that the water is that of the Styx. See more below. 366 'apes quae more parentum | rura colunt'; 'prisca' V which will hardly be approved of. 420 'sic *omnia* uerti | cernimus atque *illas* adsumere robora gentes, | concidere has'; 'omnia' hε, 'tempora' G^1V (an improvement), 'illas' vulg., 'alias' GV. 475 (already mentioned): M. well supports the use of 'includite' in this connexion. 497 sqq. 'fando aliquem Hippolytum uestras *quoque* contigit aures | credulitate patris, sceleratae fraude nouercae | occubuisse neci'; 'quoque' h, 'si' ε, 'puto' GV. After the many strong parallels adduced by Dr Magnus which favour 'si' (see especially *Met.* IX 8 'nomine si qua suo fando peruenit ad aures | Deianira tuas') I am somewhat surprised that he should reject it for 'puto'. 'si' alone explains the variants. The *s* was absorbed after 'uestras'; and 'puto' and 'quoque' are metrical corrections. The corruption was assisted by the fact that there was no very obvious apodosis to the 'si', viz. 'mirabere uixque probabo: | sed tamen ille ego sum'; for there should only be a comma after 'neci'. 514 'mihi mens interrita mansit | exiliis *contenta* suis'; 'contenta' hεV,

'intenta' G, which no doubt is simpler, though I am not sure the vulgate is wrong. 667 'peruenerunt' hG, 'conuenerunt' VϵN^2 which seems right. 675 sqq. 'cognouit numina—sacerdos | et, *deus en! deus en!* animis linguisque fauete | quisquis ades!' dixit': ita h, 'en deus est deus est' ϵGV. I prefer the reading of Riese which M. says is 'destitute of all extrinsic and intrinsic probability', as it explains the lections both of h and of ϵGV, the former having assimilated 'est' and the latter 'en'. 700 '*sexto* Pallantidos ortu', 'sexto' manche ς, 'sextae' hϵGV. M. rightly says the first is prose and the second poetry, comparing *Fast.* IV 373, VI 568, *Met.* XI 98 and other passages. 724 'hospitio *sibi iuncti* numinis usus'. So h, 'iuncti sibi' ϵGV, which M. prefers, comparing IX 499 'Saturnus Opem *iunctam sibi* sanguine duxit'. I cannot assent. Each order is right in its place; the emphasis is here on the person 'sibi', there on the relationship 'iunctam'. Besides, it makes a difference whether the abl. precede or follow; and the rhythm 'sibi iuncti' was more likely to be changed than vice versa. 726 'inmisus' h, 'inmixus' ϵGV. By a collection of the instances M. strives to show that in Ovid tradition is for *x*, not *s*, in *nitor* and cognates; his case appears to be strong. 729 sqq. 'huc omnis populi passim matrumque patrumque | obuia turba ruit quaeque ignis, Troica, *seruant* | Vesta tuos'; 'seruant' B_2, many ς, 'seruat' hϵG ('seruet' V), which seems better. 824 'Emathiaque iterum madefient caede Philippi'; 'Emathiaque' hϵV ('Emathiaeque' B_{12}), 'Emathiique' G, as in Lucan IX 271. 855 sq. 'sic *magni* cedit titulis Agamemnonis Atreus | Aegea sic Theseus, sic Pelea *uincit* Achilles': 'magni' 1 ς, 'magnis' hGV, 'magnus' ϵ, which seems better; 'uincit', 'uicit' hϵG, supported also by Juv. XIV 214: the change of tense need not distress us.

One cannot help observing how often in these recommendations and others Dr Magnus reverts to the reading of older texts, for example J. C. Jahn's. Thus in XIV 844 'fatebor', XV 62 'remotus', 92, 113, 251, 475, 498, 667, 724, 726, 855, the reading he advocates is that of Jahn; a proof indeed that later editors have not given so much attention to that edition as they should. His statements have this advantage over his neglected predecessor's that they are based on exact and recent

examination of definite manuscripts, while Jahn's and Heinsius' statements are often, perhaps not always with justice, suspected of inaccuracy. Though every reader of Dr Magnus's dissertation will echo the wish that his search for manuscripts will be rewarded by the discovery of better ones than those whose readings are here before us, it is an allowable scepticism to doubt whether such are to be found. Indeed it may be questioned whether they will enrich us by a single new reading of importance that can lay claim to any antiquity. This somewhat desponding view is confirmed by the results of Mr Housman's collation of the codices in the British Museum. 'Aeneaden' and 'Antium' 718 are now well supported; but there are no discoveries. It is confirmed also by the fact that the version of the Greek monk Planudes (which, as is well known, was made from a codex that, though bad enough in many respects, had yet sometimes preserved the truth where other authorities have lost it) presents in this part of the Metamorphoses but little of an independent value. I believe Mr Owen (*Tristia* Praef. p. lxxvi) has secured the only emendation which it will supply, xv 53 'pererratis quae spectant *aequora* terris', for 'litora' which is an explanation of the relative clause. All besides that I have been able to find—for Mr Owen's 'allisarum' in 338 will not do at all; the Clashing Rocks did not dash water on to themselves but squeezed it out between them—is ὦ ᾧτινι τὸν οὐρανόν (? = 'o cuiuis caelum', which would be a stroke nearer to 'cui ius' than the 'cuius' of our MSS.) 38 and τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ γάλακτος for 'lacteus usus' 79, apparently a misunderstanding of 'umor', to which all our MSS. have prefixed an *h*. Nor is much to be hoped from the epitomator of the Fables, on whom the editors have foisted the name of Lactantius Placidus, in Muncker's *Mythographi Latini*. It is true that he had 'aeratis (postibus)' in 620, for which he gives 'aeneis cardinibus', a reading now extant in no ancient authority; and, like Planudes (καὶ οὗτος), he had 'Hic in aquas', the reading of G, in 251. But his trustworthiness as a source may be gauged by his paraphrase of 55 sqq. 'tumulum sub quo sacrata *Crotonis* | ossa tegebat humus' cett., 'urbem constituit eamque a proximo tumulo cui *Tares* Neptuni filius subiectus erat, *Tarentum*

nominauit', and this in spite of 50, 51. We must then, I am afraid, rest our hopes of improving the text of this concluding part of Ovid's greatest poem upon conjecture only: and it is from this point of view that the following proposals are submitted.

XIV 845 sqq.

'nec mora, Romuleos cum uirgine Thaumantea
ingreditur colles. ibi sidus ab aethere lapsum
decidit in terras, a cuius lumine flagrans
Hersiliae (*or* -e) crinis cum sidere cessit in auras.
hanc manibus notis Romanae conditor arcis
excipit'.

This tradition of all our copies in 848 has rightly given offence; for no attentive reader of Ovid will suppose that he would tell you what happened to the hair of Hersilia and omit to tell you what happened to its owner. His habits are all the other way. If however there were any warrant for a nom. 'Hersilie' or 'Hersiliā', the tradition might be retained; but there is none. The conjectures hitherto proposed, 'Hersilia *e terris*' Polle, 'Hersilia *aerias*' Zingerle, 'Hersilia aetherias' Riese, are all unsatisfactory, as they fail to account for 'crinis', which is, moreover, quite in place in such a translation; compare the 'Coma Berenices' and the account of 'Dionaei Caesaris astrum' in *Met.* XV 848. The word then to attack is 'Hersilie'. It is suspicious, first because it occurs in exactly the same part of the verse, nine lines above, and secondly because 'crinis' would appear to the reader to require some explanatory addition. Further its letters are almost exactly the same as those of 'aetherias' ('etherias' = 'hersilea') a word which gives an Ovidian phrase, as Riese shows from V 511 '*auras* | exit in *aetherias*', and one appropriate in this connexion; see Cat. 66, 55 'isque per aetherias me tollens auolat auras (so ω, 'umbras' V) et Veneris casto collocat in gremio'. Such shifting of letters is quite common in Latin MSS., as Mr Housman has abundantly proved in this Journal, even where there are no auxiliary causes; and here we have seen there are two[1]. 'crin*is*' is of

[1] They are not confined to copyists. I have just looked over a well written answer in examination discussing 'the *scientific* epic of Lucretius'.

course not the nominative singular but the *acc. plur.* preserved in numerous places by the MSS. of Virgil. The acc. is to be constructed with 'flagrans' as 'nigrantes terga' Verg.; close parallels are Ov. *Met.* x 648 'fulua comam', *Aen.* vii 75 'regalis accensa comas, accensa coronam | insignem gemmis'. It is not impossible that Ovid wrote 'Crinis aetherias' and the word has been shifted by misunderstanding. It is interesting to watch how the scribes remove these accusatives in *-is* where they recognize them and leave them where they do not; a case in point is 'tenent*is*' in 630 which has been saved by the proximity of 'orb*is*'. The subject of 'flagrans' is easily continued from 'ingreditur' in the previous line.

xv 107 sqq.

'primoque e caede ferarum
incaluisse potest maculatum sanguine ferrum:
idque satis fuerat; nostrumque petentia letum
corpora missa neci salua pietate fatemur.
sed quam danda neci, tam non epulanda fuerunt.
longius inde nefas abiit'.

Now 'idque satis fuerat' is perhaps Latin of a kind for 'that should have been—ought to have been sufficient'. But such a statement is out of place where it stands; it should belong to 110. Ovid's language suggests something quite different, that is, the idea expressed by 'salua *pietate*' and in 'longius inde *nefas* abiit'. Read then

'id *quoque fas* fuerat'.

'quoque' and 'que' are frequently confused, and 'fatis' would be an easy alteration from 'fas'.

136 sqq.

'protinus ereptas uiuenti pectore fibras
inspiciunt mentesque deum scrutantur in illis.
unde fames homini uetitorum tanta ciborum [est]?
audetis uesci, genus o mortale; quod oro
ne facite et monitis animos aduertite nostris'.

This is the tradition, and it has been recognized to be un-

satisfactory. The absolute use of 'uesci' is in fact enough to condemn it. Some recent editors adopt a most unskilful conjecture of Korn, 'et illis'. That 'in' is sound, one passage is enough to show, Lucan I 611 sq. 'palluit attonitus sacris feralibus Aruns | atque *iram superum* raptis *quaesiuit in* extis'. Lachmann proposed 'genus inmortale'; but a slighter change will be more satisfactory. Read

> '*inde* (fames homini uetitorum tanta ciborum!)
> audetis uesci, genus o mortale'.

For the construction of 'inde' compare Sallust *Cat.* 22. 1 'humani corporis sanguinem uino permixtum. *inde* cum post execrationem omnes degustavissent'. It survives in Romance, e.g. Fr. *en manger*.

333 sqq.

> 'est locus Arcadiae, Pheneum dixere priores,
> ambiguis suspectus aquis, quas nocte timeto.
> nocte nocent potae; sine noxa luce bibuntur'.

This is the reading of all our codices and, as Mr Frazer has observed to me, of the epitomator. Considered in itself it might stand, though it contains an obvious δὶς ταὐτόν and the quadruple repetition of the syllable *noc* is not euphonious. But if, as I believe, Dr Magnus is right in holding that the waters of the Styx are referred to, and that the accounts of Seneca *N. Q.* III 25 1 'circa Nonacrim *in Arcadia* Styx appellata ab incolis aduenas fallit quia non facie, non odore suspecta est...aqua summa celeritate corrumpit *neque remedio locus est* quia protenus hausta duratur nec aliter quam gypsum sub umore constringitur et adligat uiscera', and of Pliny 31. 26 '*in Arcadia ad Pheneum* aqua profluit e saxis Styx appellata quae ilico *necat*', 2. 231 'iuxta Nonacrim *in Arcadia* Styx nec odore differens nec colore *epota* ilico *necat*', are in close relationship to Ovid's here (which seems highly probable as Seneca quotes from the immediate context four times in chapters 20 and 25 and Pliny refers in 2. 230 to the 'Lyncestis aqua' *Met.* XV 329), then it is not rash to suppose that we should read

> 'nocte *necant* potae; sine noxa luce bibuntur'.

477 sq.

'perdite siqua nocent, uerum haec quoque perdite tantum;
ora uacent *epulis* alimentaque mitia carpant'.

Pythagoras in winding up his sermon returns to the text of vegetarianism as more fully expressed in v. 75 and following. Was this to abstain from *feasting*? Not at all. It was to abstain from *feasting* on *forbidden* meats; 75 '*dapibus* temerare *nefandis* | corpora': not a word against other feasts; 81 'prodiga diuitias alimentaque mitia tellus | suggerit atque *epulas* sine caede et sanguine praebet'. It is these feasts, the feasts of blood, that are forbidden: the bloodshed is dwelt on with such persistence that one wonders if the commentators have been blind and deaf not to detect it here. 96—8 'at uetus illa aetas cui fecimus aurea nomen | ...fortunata fuit nec polluit ora *cruore*', 107 'maculatum *sanguine* ferrum', 128 'numenque supernum | *caede* laboriferi credunt gaudere iuuenci', 134 'percussaque *sanguine* cultros | inficit', 174, 175 'parcite, uaticinor, cognatas *caede* nefanda | exturbare animas nec *sanguine* sanguis alatur'. It is clear then that we should read

'ora <*cruore*> uacent alimentaque mitia carpant',

the similarity of the letters *ora ore* having caused the loss and 'epulis' being an unskilful metrical stop-gap, suggested by someone who remembered 110 'sed quam danda neci, tam *non epulanda* fuerunt'. Ovid seems to have fancied the jingle of the two words. See, besides 98, XIV 238 where also they begin a line[1].

774

'quid nunc antiqua recordor
damna mei generis? timor hic meminisse priorum

[1] The extraordinary variant 'congrua' which some of the worst copies show for 'mitia' is perhaps only an attempt at botching; but it is curious that all the letters of *cruore* have equivalents in '*cōgrua*'. The appearance of the right reading or its remains in the wrong place is one of the most interesting phenomena in textual corruption. A noteworthy example is Propertius III 3 29 'ergo Musarum et Sileni patris imago' where the margins of DV give the variant 'origo' for 'imago'. This is simply 'orgia (mystarum)', Heinsius's excellent emendation for 'ergo', with a single letter altered and displaced. For 'orgia' see especially Seneca *Oed.* 435 sqq.

non sinit; *en,* acui sceleratos cernitis enses,
quos prohibete precor facinusque repellite'.

This is Riese's reading from a correction in h. But the first hand has 'en *me*'; from which most MSS. have the crude alteration 'in me'. The worthy Planudes translates *ἰδοὺ γὰρ εἰς ἐμὲ θηγόμενα βλέπετε ἀνόσια ξίφη*, conflating original and correction as he has done in XI 163, where he translates both 'retorsit' (*λέλυκεν*) and 'resoluit' (*ἔτρεψεν*) (Boissonade), and in XIII 956 sqq., where his translation is in hopeless confusion; compare also XI 545 'Astraei—fratres' Ovid, *οἱ Ἀστραῖοι ἄνεμοι* Plan. where the original has disappeared. The tradition then is 'en me'; and for this 'en' does not account.

I propose

'*anne* acui sceleratos cernitis enses?'

ne, often separated in manuscripts from the word to which it belongs, has been corrupted to *me* as at Prop. IV 2 62 'ne' N, 'me' O; compare id. II 19 2 'sine me' DV, 'si me' FN.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Postscript.

Happening to be in Bâle this summer I looked at the 'codices *membranacei*' of the *Metamorphoses* in the University Library. There are three (F II 26, 27, 28) all a good deal older than the 'chartacei' which Dr Magnus has collated. The best is F II 26, perhaps of the 13th century. Compare Loers, preface to his edition of the *Metamorphoses* where its readings are cited as from 'Basil. I', but inaccurately, as far as I tested it. The following variants, which, except a few unimportant ones I here omit, are all that I had time to note, will give some idea of its value.

XIV 829 *and* 834 coniunx 847 Hersilie XV 20 Micthylus, *mg. m.* 2 mictilus 22 age *supra scr. m.* 2 eia 25 Postea discendunt 34 simul *om., add. mg. m.* 2 42 culpas 43 tristis sententia 50 Lacedaemoniumque Tarentum 51

sallantinumque uerethum 52 Taurinosque—nemesenque 54 Inuenit epherei 62 remotus 93 ritusque 104 deorum 107 potest 113 Eruerat—interceperat 114 mactatus 126 Tot 131 insignis 146 inuestigata 182 Vrgeturque eadem ueniens 211 sparsis quoque tempora canis 230 solidarum—ferarum 251 Hinc 279 amasenus harenas 332 lacus archadie phoenū 364 I quoque delectos 475 formidatis—illudite *supra scr. m.* 2 † includite 497 si contigit 504 Dampnauit meritumque nichil pater eicit urbe 591 capitis noua cornua fronde (so practically GV) 625 arcesserit 647 certasque abicere sortes 667 Conueniunt 677 Et deus est deus est 718 Antium] ancum *supra scr.* r *m.* 2 [F II 28 interpolates to ancō F II 27 omits the line] 804 Aeneaden] mēdū [looks rather like inēdū. Of the other two MSS. one reads 'aetheria' and the other was copied from one which did, as it omits all after Cy*therea* 803 to after ae*therea* in 804] 876 erit deflebile.

APPENDIX.

The following excerpts come from three MSS. of Ovid's Metamorphoses in the British Museum: a = Kings 26 saec. XI—XII, b = Burn. 224 saec. XIII, e = Harl. 2742 saec. XIII. Where one of these letters stands within brackets it signifies that in reporting the reading of the MS. I have ignored for brevity's sake some trivial error of spelling. The two MSS. mentioned at XV 737 as c and d are Burn. 223 saec. XIII and Harl. 2737 saec. XII—XIII which I have examined enough to see that they are useless. A. E. H.

XIV 832 *latio* ab, *lacia* e. 836 *quirini* abe. 844 *uidebor* a, *fatebor* be.

XV 34 *pertimuit* abe. 37 *patet* abe^2, *patens* e^1. *est* om. abe. 42 *culpas* a, *culpa* be. 50 *Sal. Ner.*] *lac. tar.* be. 51 *Lac. Tar.*] *sal. ner.* b(e). a omits *Sal.—Sybarin:* in the margin a second hand adds *praeterit et sybarim surrentinumque*

merentum before 52. 52 *que et* abe. 88 *in uiscera* ae, *in uiscere* b. 92 *creat* ab, *parit* e. 93 *rictus* corr. in *ritus* a, *ritus* be. 100 *aruis* abe. 107 *potest* abe, *puto* b uar., *putem* e supraser. 113 *eruerit* abe. *interceperit* ab, *intercipit* e. 114 *mactatus* a, *mactatur* b, *mactandus* e. 115 *dicitur* a, *ultoris ductus* b, *ducitur* e in ras. 126 *tot* abe. 131 *insignis* ae, *presignis* b, but *pre* is in ras. and there is an erasure of two letters before it. 136 *pectore* abe. 137 *ciborum est* ae, *ciborum* b. 170 *formas—easdem* abe. 173 *ne* abe. 180 *ac* abe. 182 *eadem ueniens* abe. 186 *emensas* ae, *emeritas* b which has in mg. *extensas uel emersas* (corr. ex *emensas*). 188 *lassa* abe. 201 *et lactens* ae, *et lactans* b. 202 *nitens* a, *recens* be. 205 *ludit* ab, *ridet* e. 217 *primae matrisque* ab, *matris primae* e. *habitauimus* abe. 230 *solidarum more ferarum* abe. 232 *asperit* abe. 244 *distent* a, *distant* be. 251 *hic* ae, *hinc* b. 253 *reddit* ab, *reparat* e, b uar. 254 *toto* abe. 255 *faciemque* abe. 272 *exceta* corr. in *excecata* a, *exsiccata* (*sic* in ras.) b, *exsiccata* e. 275 *toto modo* ab, *modo tecto* e. 284 *fecerat* abe. 304 sq. *direpta bicornis—capri* abe. 307 *et* a, *aut* be. 311 *athamantis* ab, *ahalantis* e. 315 *oris* a, *horis* b, *aruis* e ex corr. 317 *mirum est* abe. 320 *siquis* abe. 339 *in monte* a[1], *immotae* be. 359 *uenenis* ae, *ueneno* b. 364 *his quoque dilectus* a, *i quoque delectos* (*dilectos* b) be. 416 *coralium* abe. 443 *patrio* abe. 453 *ne* ae, *non* b. 455 *que et* a, *et* be. 458 *pectora* abe. 459 *possunt* abe. 464 *corpora cultro* ab, *gutora ferro* e. 473 *que* om. e. 475 *illudite* a, *includite* b, *ludite* e with an erasure of 3 letters preceding. 481 *latialis* ab(e). 497 *quoque* ae, *si* b. 515 *contenta* a(b)(e). 522 *circamuertitur* ab, *circumuoluitur* e; all three have *quae* for *qua*. 525 *que* om. abe. 526 *que* om. abe: *reprehensa* ae, *reprensa* b. 531 *luce c. regna* ab, *c. regna* (om. *luce*: add. man. 2) e. 541 *creta deloque* a, *delo cretaque* (b)e. 546 *assentior* ae, *acceptior* b. 552 *At* a, *Haec* b, *Et* e. 570 *cornua* ab, *manus et eodem lumina* e. 596 *nobis* abe. 625 *accesserit* a, *adiecerit* b, *acerserit* e (mg. *arcesserit*). 630 *tenentis* a[1]be. 634 *pharetras* ae, *pharetrae* b. 636 *corpora* ab, *pectora* e. 640 *accersite* a, b (ex *arcessite*), *arcessite* e. 644 *simul incurua* ab, *postquam incurua* e.

647 *certas ita* b, *certant adiiere* a, *certant adicere* e (*ita dicere* suprascr.). 662 *uerti—debent* abe. 667 *peruenium* ab, *cum ueniunt* e. 677 *en—est—est* ab, *en—en—est* e. 678 *ades* abe[1]. (678 sq. om. e in text., add. in mg. man. ead.). 680 *uisum* abe, *iussum* b uar. 682 *mente et uoce* abe. 683 *pignora* abe. 685 *tum* ae, *tunc* b. 694 *pressaque d. g. carina* abe. 696 *nauis* abe. 700 *sextae* abe. 703 *amphisia* a, *amphirsia* b, *amfrigia* e (*mfri* ex corr.). 705 *Romethium* ab, *Rometheum* e. 713 *lentisciferum* ab(e). 718 *antium* a, *ancon* b, *acon* e[1]. 723 *placato* abe. 724 *iuncti sibi* abe. 726 *innixus* abe. 729 ab have the abbreviation which stands for *omnis* and *omnes* alike, but e has *oēs*, i.e. the scribe began to write *omnis* and altered it to *omnes*. 730 *seruat* abe. 737 *accliuia* ab, e ex corr. (cd have *acclinia*). 740 *a parte* ae, *de parte* (om. *que*) b. 751 *ullum maius opus* ab, *ullum opus maius est* e. 776 *in me* abe. 790 *currus* abe. 793 *minantia* ab, *minancia* e. 804 *et aeneaden* e[1] (and *conatur* for *molitur*), *et etherea* ab. 811 *concussum* abe. 818 *colatur* ab, *locetur* e. 820 *caesique* ab, e (corr. ex *cessique*). 829 *barbariem* a[1] corr. in *-am*, *barbariam* be. *gentesque* abe. 838 *n. n. c. senior similes* ab(e). 848 *sinu* be, *simul* a (and *simul euolat* for *luna uolat*). 855 *ntagnus* a (corr. in *-is*), be. 856 *uicit* ae, *uincit* b. 866 *arces* abe. 869 *temperat* abe. 876 *indeflebile* a, *indelebile* be.

ON THE COMPOSITION OF SOME GREEK MANUSCRIPTS.

THE way in which the sheets of a Greek manuscript were written and put together is a matter that may have importance for the philologist as well as the palaeographer; questions of criticism often turn on such points as whether marginal notes are in the same hand as the text, and whether part of a MS. is earlier or later than the rest. Information on these questions can be obtained only by an examination of the writing of the MSS. themselves (for external and explicit evidence hardly if ever exists in the documents in which we possess the classics): and that the conclusion of such an examination may be sound, it must be comparative, and the particular MS. must be shown to agree in general with the usage of MSS. contemporary to it. To the palaeographer the interest of the enquiry consists in that he is able to reconstruct the circumstances under which the MS. was written, and to supply data some of which might have been given by a subscription.

I propose to consider from this point of view the manner in which several tenth and eleventh century Greek MSS. were written. This period, the years about 1000 A.D., has given us the greatest quantity of important MSS. of the classics: in number, the following centuries surpass the tenth and early eleventh, but in many cases the MSS. are copies more or less direct of originals of the period we are considering. Ninth and early tenth century MSS. are naturally very valuable, but their rarity makes them comparatively exceptions. The MSS. that decide the text of the majority of Greek authors will be found to date from about the year 1000 A.D. The hand in which

they are written is well marked. It belongs to a small and comparatively cursive type of writing, which in the early part of the tenth century separated from the larger and more formal minuscule appropriated to ecclesiastical books; the smaller hand was suited to works of larger extent and that involved close study. Naturally therefore it was applied for the most part to classical authors, but there is nothing to prevent an ecclesiastical text appearing in it[1]. Dated examples are the Aristotle Ven. 201 of A.D. 955 (Wattenbach and von Velsen, Exempla codicum graecorum no. V), and the Gregory of Nazianzus, Paris suppl. grec 469 A of A.D. 986 (Omont, Facsimilés datés de la Bibliothèque Nationale no. VIII[1]). From this hand is descended lineally the writing of the MSS. we are considering. It is fluent, sharp, a good deal ligatured, the letters ornamental and varied; the whole bears the air of being written with ease. These are its differences from early minuscule: from the later style it differs in the following respects. While varied, it is regular, always well-proportioned, the work of a scribe master of his art, and the quality of beauty, the distinctive attribute of early minuscule, remains in this hand. In size it is generally small, but it varies between the dimensions of the text of the Venetian Iliad (Marc. 454), and its scholia or the Paris Aristotle (grec 1741). Some hands are more ornamental than others, rounder, more upright, with more difference between the up and the down stroke. A subdivision almost may be made upon this point of difference; a certain number of MSS. of this period show a comparatively rough and uncalligraphic hand, in which the strokes of the letters are very much of one thickness throughout; such, with variations, are the Plutarch, Laur. 69, 6 of A.D. 997 (W. V. no. IX), Nicander, Paris suppl. grec 247 (Omont, Facsimilés des plus anciens MSS. no. XXXVIII. 4), Iliad, Laur. 32. 15 (a rough facsimile in La Roche's Iliad vol. I.).

The MSS. that we are to deal with possess the remarkable characteristic that they have no subscriptions; neither their year nor their place is known. The period to which they are

[1] For instance, Epistles Vat. 2080, Acts and Epistles Barocci 3. Many catenas are in a more or less cursive hand.

referred, about the year 1000 A.D., is therefore a matter of inference. The nearest date antecedent is that of the MS. Paris suppl. grec 469 A already cited, A.D. 986; the MSS. later than the year 1000 that most nearly resemble the type seem to be that of St Maximus, Paris grec 1097, A.D. 1059 (Omont, Facsimilés datés XXVI[I]), and the Psalter, Paris grec 40 of the same year (ib. XXVI[II]). The absence of subscription or date is a singularity that requires explanation. The Plutarch of 997, which has been quoted above, is not an entirely typical representative of the class. It is a peculiarity of classical MSS. in general, as opposed to sacred ones, that they are unsigned and undated.

It is probably impossible to make a complete list of these MSS. It may be useful however to collect those which may be studied in facsimile:

At Paris:

Scholia to Aristotle, grec 1853 (Omont, facs. des plus anciens Mss. XXX).

Anthology, suppl. grec 384 (ib. XXXIII; a photograph of the whole, made by the Heidelberg authorities, may be found in some principal libraries).

Apollonius, grec 2548, a slightly different type (ib. XXXVI).

Aristotle, grec 1741 (ib. XXXVII, Pal. Soc. II. 47: facsimile of ff. 184—199 containing the Poetics, Paris, 1891).

Lexica, Coislin 345 (ib).

Theognis, suppl. grec 388 (ib. XXXVIII. 2).

Strabo, grec 1397 (ib. XL).

At Venice:

Iliad, Marc. 454 (W. V. XXXII and XXXIII, Dindorf Scholia in Iliadem, I. pp. 156, 356).

Hippocrates, Marc. 269 (first hand, W. V. XL).

Plutarch, Marc. 250 (W. V. XLIV).

Also at Venice, though not facsimiled, Demosthenes, Marc. 418, Aristides append. class. VIII. cod. VII.

At Florence:

Sophocles, Aeschylus, Apoll. Rhodius, Laur. 32. 9, for which see below.

Demosthenes, Laur. 59. 9 (Vitelli and Paoli, Facsimili fiorentini I. 12, Pal. Soc. II. 88 and 89).

Iliad, Laur. 32. 15 (see above).

Odyssey, Laur. 32. 24 (W. V. XXXVIII).

At Ravenna:

Aristophanes, 134, 4, A (Pal. Soc. II. 105, 106, Wattenbach, Scripturae Graecae specimina, 26).

At Heidelberg:

Anthology, Palat. XXIII (W. V. XXXVI).

I. The first book of this class the external arrangements of which I wish to consider, is the well-known Florentine MS. that is the principal authority for the text of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Apollonius Rhodius. A complete facsimile of as much as contains Sophocles was made by the English Hellenic Society in 1885[1]; and the Italian authorities have recently executed a facsimile of Aeschylus, which it may be hoped before long will be published. Single pages will be found in reproduction as follows:

Aeschylus: Pal. Soc. I. 83, Collezione fiorentina I. 9.
Sophocles: W. V. 35, Wattenbach Script. Graec. specimina 25.
Apollonius: W. V. 36.

We have the further advantage of the judgment of two eminent palaeographers upon the different points connected with the MS. Mr Maunde Thompson contributes an introduction to the Hellenic Society's facsimile, in which a masterly account is given of the book as a whole, and of the part containing Sophocles in detail. Mr Thompson acknowledges his obligation on many points of detail to Professor Girolamo Vitelli, of Florence, the co-editor of the "Collezione fiorentina

[1] Facsimile of a Laurentian Manuscript of Sophocles with an introduction by E. M. Thompson and R. C. Jebb. London: printed for the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. 1885.

di facsimili paleographici" and to whom is due the minute collation of the text of Aeschylus in Wecklein's edition (Berlin, 1885). It is obvious how much any student of the MS. must benefit by such authoritative predecessors. My own acquaintance with the MS. may reckon several years; in the Christmas vacation of 1892 I had the opportunity of studying it at leisure. The description is as follows:

Laur. 32. 9, membr., 331 × 211 millim., ff. 264 (ff. 1—118 Sophocles, 119—189 Aeschylus, 190—264 Apollonius Rhodius); lines to the page, 42 to 48. Gathers of four sheets, ruled and arranged in the usual manner (upon which I may refer to Thompson, Introduction, p. 6), signed at the top outside corner of the first page.

(SOPHOCLES.)

Quires:

(1) ff. 1—8, signature gone (f. 1 r. inc. Ajax).

(2) ff. 9—16, id. (16 v. at the bottom, expl. Ajax).

(3) ff. 17—24, id. (17 r. inc. Electra).

(4) ff. 25—32, id. I cannot perceive the trace of a signature which according to Prof. Vitelli is visible on 25 r.

(5) ff. 33—40 signature gone (33 v. expl. Electra, inc. Oed. Tyr.).

(6) ff. 44—48, signature gone.

(7) ff. 49—56, signature gone (49 r. expl. Oed. Tyr. 49 v. inc. Antigone).

(8) ff. 57—64, signature gone (64 r. expl. Antigone, 64 v. inc. Trachiniae).

(9) ff. 65—72, signature gone.

(10) ff. 73—80, signature gone (79 v. expl. Trach., inc. Philoctetes).

(11) ff. 81—88, on 81 r. are the lower halves of the letters ια.

(12) ff. 89—96, signature gone (96 r. expl. Phil., inc. Oed. Col.).

(13) ff. 97—104, signature gone.

(14) ff. 105—112, id.

(15) ff. 113—118, signature gone, three sheets only, the first two a pair, a single one in the centre. (118 r. expl. Oed. Col., 118 v. is blank.)

(Aeschylus.)

(16) ff. 119—126, signature gone (119 r. inc. Persae).

(17) ff. 127—134, id. (127 r. a new hand begins in the text, 131 r. expl. Persae, inc. Agamemnon; 134 v. ends with Agam. 310).

(18) Perished.

(19) Represented by the first sheet marked $\iota\theta$ in the top outside corner, ff. 135 and 136. f. 135 contains Agamemnon 1067 to 1159, f. 136 contains Choephoroe 10 to 102. Had there been no independent evidence, the extent of the earlier portion of the Agamemnon lost might have been approximately estimated by counting the lines contained in one quire. No guess on the other hand could have been made as to where the Agamemnon ended and the Choephoroe began.

(20) ff. 137—144, marked at the top κ (137 r. inc. Choeph. 103).

(21) ff. 145—152, top signature gone: in the bottom outside corner, the letter $\bar{\varsigma}$ (not $\sigma\tau$). (147 v. expl. Choeph., inc. Prom. Vinct.)

(22) ff. 153—160, at top κβ: at bottom $\bar{\zeta}$. (159 v. expl. Prom., inc. Eumen.)

(23) ff. 161—168, at top the remains of κΓ, at bottom $\bar{\eta}$.

(24) ff. 169—176, at top κΔ, at bottom $\bar{\theta}$. (169 v. expl. Eumen., inc. Septem c. Thebas.)

(25) ff. 177—184, top signature gone, at bottom $\bar{\iota}$. (179 v. expl. Sept. c. Th., inc. Supplices.)

(26) ff. 185—189: top signature gone, no signature at bottom. Two sheets, with one half-sheet (f. 186) inserted between the two anterior leaves (188 r. expl. Suppl., 188 v. and 189 r. *Αἰσχύλου Βίος*, 189 v. is blank).

(Apollonius.)

(27) ff. 190—197, signature gone. (190 r. inc. lib. I.)

(28) ff. 198—205, marked ιβ.

(29) ff. 206—213, the lower part of ιΓ. (207 v. expl. lib. I., inc. lib. II.)

(30) ff. 214—221, lower part of ιδ.

(31) ff. 222—229, lower part of ιε. (224 r. expl. lib. II., inc. lib. III.)

(32) ff. 230—237, signature gone.

(33) ff. 238—245, id. (241 v. expl. lib. III., inc. lib. IV.).

(34) ff. 246—254, signature gone. Four sheets and one half-sheet (f. 253), inserted between the hinder leaves of the third and fourth.

(35) ff. 255—262, signature gone. The *former half of the second sheet* (f. 256), and the *latter half of the third* (f. 260) have been cut off and restored, the new portion in each case being glued to the remainder.

(36) ff. 263 and 264, signed κ. One sheet: the hair-side is, contrary to custom, turned outwards. (263 v. expl. lib. IV., seq. *γένος ἀπολλωνίου*, 264 v. is blank.)

There is nothing abnormal in the arrangement of these quires as far as the 21st, page 145. The loss of a quire or two is unfortunately not a rare thing in classical MSS.; the extent of the loss, one gather and the three inside sheets of the next, is fixed by the signature *ιθ* on the first leaf of the surviving sheet, f. 135. The circumstance that does need explanation is the double signature of the gathers of Aeschylus, which begins at gather κα, f. 145 and continues, with the exception of the last gather, to the end of Aeschylus: and further the seemingly incorrect numbering of the quires of Apollonius. Aeschylus was signed so as to follow Sophocles, and the numerals that remain are in correct sequence. One would have expected accordingly, the first quire of Apollonius, the 27th in the whole book, to be numbered κζ: instead of this, the second gather of Apollonius is marked ιβ, and the first was presumably marked ια. What is the reason for this new system, and what was Apollonius intended to follow? One might suppose, Aeschylus: but in Aeschylus there are eleven gathers, and the first of Apollonius should therefore have been ιβ and not ια. And even in this case, why does the numeration begin with Aeschylus, with no account taken of Sophocles? Further, what is the

meaning of the double series of numbers on the quires of Aeschylus?

Our data do not enable us to solve this problem entirely; the key to it, as Mr Thompson says (p. 6) lies in the double numbering of Aeschylus. I may notice in passing, and somewhat to anticipate, that the signatures all through the book appear to me to be in the same hand, and that the hand of the scholia. The similarity between these numerals, which are capitals or (in the case of the lower signatures in Aeschylus) large minuscules, and the large capitals which often begin paragraphs of scholia, seem to make this identification probable. Re-numbering an already signed manuscript is not an uncommon phenomenon. Quires in course of time get lost or misplaced, numerals are erased or cut off at a rebinding, and it may be found necessary to re-number the gathers. Probably the majority of existing quire-signatures are non-original; the accidents to which books are exposed are so many, that it is comparatively rare to find the original numerals in their place. Either they have gone without trace,—the case in the Sophocles of our MS.—or they have been supplanted by a late series. In all these cases however the character of the numbering betrays its lateness: in the instance before us we have two independent sets of signatures in the same hand. There must have been a reason in the original composition of the book to occasion this. The upper numerals connect Aeschylus with Sophocles: the lower numerals must have had a similar purpose. There is no disturbance in the gathers of Aeschylus to call for a new numbering: the second series of signatures must refer to something exterior. Now when we notice that these second numerals, beginning at the sixth quire with ϛ, go on as far as ι at the tenth quire, and pass over the 11th gather altogether, it is plain that they are intended to connect with some book that already began at ια; and this of course is the case with Apollonius. The necessity of finding a reason for this double notation of Aeschylus, then, seems to show that the numbering of Apollonius was previous to the lower numbering of Aeschylus, and not vice versâ. We also obtain an explanation of the otherwise singular circumstance that the last gather in

Aeschylus is passed over in this series. The numeration of Apollonius has next to be explained. For this the solution given by Mr Thompson seems very probable: that the Apollonius was given to be written before the Aeschylus was finished, and that the supervising scribe (the scholiast) calculated the number of quires that would be needed for Aeschylus at ten, and therefore numbered the first quire of Apollonius ια. His calculation was not far out. The Aeschylus in fact took five pages over the ten quires, and therefore when it was numbered to correspond with Apollonius, this extra piece had to be passed over. So far we may think we see into the matter: why Apollonius was intended to follow Aeschylus only and not Sophocles, while before Aeschylus had been prefixed to Apollonius, it had been itself subjoined to Sophocles, the whole arrangement being apparently the work of one person, we must leave unexplained.

The next point to be considered is the number of hands in the MS., and the share that each took in its composition. The text of the MS. is written in minuscule, the scholia in the modification of capitals that is called semiuncial. By this arrangement, common though not universal at this period, text and commentary are conveniently distinguished, a matter otherwise often of difficulty, when the colour of the ink is the same, and the abundance of the scholia causes them to be written more or less in amongst the text. Several pages in the latter part of the Aeschylus are an instance of this. In the course of the eleventh century the employment of semiuncial for scholia becomes rarer, and from about 1050 onwards author and comment are written in the same hand and are only distinguished by size. We have therefore an immediate difficulty that belongs to MSS. of this period: is the minuscule of the text the same hand as the small capitals of the margin, and if there is more than one hand in the text, which if either of the two wrote these capitals? The general rule in these cases is, to look for instances of semiuncial in the text, e.g. in headings, titles, dramatis personae and the like, and in the margin for similar relapses into minuscule, generally to be found in various readings, omitted lines, arguments prefixed to the text, and so

forth. By this means the two styles of writing are brought into contact, and can be compared directly with each other. Before however we proceed to this comparison in our case, we may notice an obvious difference of hand in the text. Sophocles is all written by one scribe, and Apollonius by the same writer, who has also written the first quire of Aeschylus: the rest of Aeschylus including the lost quires, is in a different hand. 1—126, and 190—264 are by one writer, whom I shall call the 'first scribe,' 127—189 by another, the 'second scribe.' These hands are contemporary but very unlike. According to my impression of them, the first hand is more regular and more delicate, the letters have a regular not very great inclination to the right, are horizontal to the line with a tendency to run above it, and the contrast between thick and thin in the strokes gives the letters a very calligraphic appearance. The second hand has an appearance of less care, it is flatter and blunter, the strokes thicker, and the words have a great tendency to fall below the line; the size of the hand also alters considerably, on f. 135 for instance it becomes very small. To pass to the scholia, this hand as compared with other semiuncial, is blunt and legible, without any pretensions to ornament, or very great regularity; the strokes are much of a thickness: it is far from having the prettiness of the semiuncial of the Arethas MSS. of a century earlier, or of much that may be seen in contemporary ecclesiastical MSS. This hand I call 'the scholiast.' The question whether either of the text hands is the same as the scholiast, may be settled at once by inspecting specimens of semiuncial by either writer: such are for the first scribe, the title, argument and colophon of the Ajax ff. 1 r. and 16 v. the title and argument to the Electra f. 17 r., and the person-names in the margins, the colophon and ornaments at the end of the Oed. Tyr. f. 49 r. These are in a semiuncial that is obviously not that of the scholiast; it is freer, and has the same delicate strokes and adornments as the first hand. For the second scribe, the person-names from 127 sq. in the margin are by his hand, though the scholiast has often supplied them where they were omitted; ἄτοccα for instance on f. 127 r. is by the second hand, and f. 134 v. at Ag. 281 κλγται (with μ above) of the second hand is crossed

out and ΑΓΓ written by the scholiast. These proofs will be added to afterwards, but of themselves they are sufficient to show that we have three hands at work in the book, two who write the text, a third who writes the scholia. There remains another point to be noticed: not only do the minuscule hands of the text give us occasionally semiuncials, but in the margin there are a good many specimens of minuscule. So on f. 1 r. against Ajax 50 is written *ἢ καὶ διψῶσαν*, Ajax 57 *ἢ παρών*, 58 *ἢ ἐμπεσών*, 60 *ἢ εἰς ἐρινῦν κακήν*, f. 2 r. Ajax 115 *ἢ ἐννέπεις*. This is a minuscule that is different from either of the two text hands; its characteristics are given by Mr Thompson pp. 10, 11 "we should distinguish the latter [sc. the minuscule of the scholiast] for greater freedom and flexibility. In the text, the letters which descend under the line, are as a rule short, and turn at the end; while the hand of the diorthotes is almost invariably stiff, lengthened and formal." Is this hand then the work of a fourth scribe, or is it the scholiast writing in minuscule? Now the practice of other MSS. is that various readings as distinguished from comments, assimilate themselves to the hand of the text, and become minuscule if the text is written in minuscule. This practice may be studied, for example, in the Arethas-scholia. We are prepared therefore to find that these minuscule annotations, which as will be seen later are mostly textual in character, are the work of the scholiast. The palaeographical demonstration cannot be given better than in the words of Mr Thompson, p. 10: "just at first there is a certain difficulty in reconciling them [the minuscule and semiuncial hands], as, for his corrections and various readings the diorthotes usually employs minuscule characters, whilst the scholia are in the mixture of uncials and minuscules to which the name of half-uncial writing has been given. The hand of the scholia is seen to be delicate but rather stiff, with an inclination to lengthen the strokes of letters under the line, as *μ*, *ρ*, *φ*, and sometimes *π* and *τ*. Comparing it in these points with the minuscule writing of the diorthotes, the similarity of the two is evident." To this internal proof an external argument may be added. The hypotheses etc. in the portion of Aeschylus that is written by the second hand, are as

will be seen later often supplied by the scholiast. The argument to the Prometheus Vinctus f. 145 r. is a case in point; here we find both minuscule and semiuncial combined in one piece of writing; the body of the argument is in the small minuscule that we find in the margins, the dramatis personae are in the familiar semiuncial of the scholia. The conclusion is that the minuscule style of the scholiast is the minuscule that we find so often in the margin, and that accordingly the semiuncial scholia and the minuscule annotations are the work of the same scribe.

There are no ancient hands in the book that do not fall under one or other of these classes (the writing on the extreme margin will be dealt with later), and we may therefore consider the original book as the work of three scribes, two who wrote the text, and one who wrote the scholia and the other marginal notes. This is also the opinion of Signor Vitelli, quoted by Mr Thompson.

A note may be added upon the abbreviations of the manuscript: in the text they are rare, in the scholia frequent, but very little remarkable. The sign ⌢ still represents ιν and ειν as well as ην, but εις is ˢˢ although we do not find ˢ̈ for ις. In the scholia, and the minuscule hypotheses by the first scribe, we find the signs for ἀπό, κατά, παρά and πρός, and the syllables αρ, ερ, ωρ, but the only at all rare symbol used seems to be that for ευ, which in the combination ευς may be seen on f. 83 r. in the word αχιλλευς. M. Albert Martin finds the same sign in the scholia to the Ravenna Aristophanes (*Les scolies du ms. d'Aristophane*, p. xviii), and besides the regular tachygraphical MSS. it is to be found in the Aristotle Ven. 201 (a. 955). Sig. Vitelli quotes an instance of ἔσται from the Aeschylus scholia (*Museo italiano* I. p. 168): one of the most curious usages in the MS. is the formation of the syllable τες by τ followed by the sign for εσ, with two dots added above: this singular and seemingly superfluous combination may be seen in the Sophocles facsimile p. 96 r. in the argument to the Oed. Col. γέροντες, cf. also καθαίροντες 64 r. in the argument to the Antigone, 33 r. προσαγορεύοντες and often. The same peculiarity occurs in the Ravenna Aristophanes, and in a MS. of Demosthenes, Ven. 418:

the scholia of the Venetian Iliad do not exhibit it[1]. The unusual form of *παρά* that Prof. Vitelli cites from our MS. (l. c. p. 14, plate IX. 7) is merely an expedient for ease in writing, whereby the curved top of the *π* in a hand of this sort is made to do duty for the curve that properly forms the lower part of the symbol.

We may now investigate the share that these three scribes took in the composition of the book. It is to be understood that except where it is stated otherwise, the text is written by the first and second hands, the scholia by the third.

Sophocles.

The titles, colophons and arguments are written by the first scribe: in most places this is obvious, and the contrast with the more regular semiuncial of the scholiast is marked: the title to Ajax, f. 1 r. might seem doubtful, but its similarity to the scholia may be explained from the fact that the first scribe, like many writers of MSS. begins his task prudently, in a regular and small hand: confidence and the feeling that the material will not give out, soon relaxes this severity, and already the colophon *σοφοκλεους αἴας μαστιγοφόρος* on f. 16 v. is written more freely. The names of persons are by the first scribe, often in minuscule; here and there a name, where it has been omitted, is added by the scholiast, e.g. ἄγγε on 43 r. and 63 r. Independently of the hand, the fact that the person-names were written before the scholia is plain from 3 v. where the scholia are written partly round τεκμσα, and 33 v. where similarly the name *ἱερεῦς πρεσβύτης* is encased in a paragraph of scholia. Variants introduced by *ἢ* are frequent in the margin, in the minuscule of the scholiast: some instances of these have been already given: it is to be noticed that several variants written in the margin by the scholiast are not in minuscule but in semiuncial: some of these are accompanied by a short explanation or comment, and may therefore be considered as short scholia, e.g. 6 r. *ἢ οὐκ ἔχοντος· τὸ ἔγκλημα*

[1] Instances of MSS. with this peculiarity, but not belonging to this class, are Paris grec 155 (a Catena), and MS. Genoa 3 (Missione di s. Carlo, a Psalter s. XI).

τῆς φυγῆς αὐτῶν· κτλ., 6 v. ℔ ἀτίζων ὑβρίζων παρὰ τὸ ὁμήρου· κτλ., 10 v. ℔ τοσαῦτά σοι κτλ., 11 v. ℔ ἴωμοι κτλ., 109 v. ℔ ὀρειοβάταν κτλ.; but there are other examples, e.g. 9 r. ℔ ὑπέρμεγα, 18 r. ℔ ποινία ἀρά, 32 r., 34 v., 35 r., 57 r. bis, 58 v., where the variant is undistinguishable from the ordinary variant in minuscule, and we must accordingly say that the scribe has used, either from inadvertence or indifference, one style instead of the other. It is to be noticed that these variants are *variae lectiones* proper, that is alternatives, and are not intended to take the place of what stands in the text: the sign ℔ is to be read γράφεται rather than γράφε or γραπτέον: cf. the expansion of it on f. 32 v. The margin however contains plenty of corrections properly so called; the first hand occasionally corrects his own writing. 34 r. he adds in the margin, huddled up, Oed. Tyr. 62; f. 47 r. after Oed. Tyr. 1299 he had written προσ σῆι δυσδαίμονι μοῖρα, in error, which he expresses by prefixing a small hook or crescent (ↄ), the proper mark of omission at this period; some hand, which it is hard to identify, has then dotted the line over, another usual expedient, and lastly someone else has scored it out with a knife. Similar proceedings have taken place on f. 252 v. Apoll. Rhod. IV. 950 sq. More often however the omitted lines are added, and corrections in the text are made, by the scholiast: so f. 17 r. Electra 15 is added in minuscule by the scholiast with $\overset{x}{\sigma\tau\iota}$ prefixed (a usual method in MSS. of denoting that matter written in the margin is an addition to the text and not comment, but not in the manner of our scholiast: compared with the same word ff. 23 r. 27 v. and 32 v., I incline to think $\overset{x}{\sigma\tau\iota}$ on 17 r. the addition of a later hand): f. 50 v. Antig. 68 and 69 having been omitted by the first scribe from a similarity of openings, are added by the scholiast, 68 in the margin, 69 in the text, the first scribe's περισσά at the beginning of 70 being erased: f. 66 v. Trach. 177 is added to the text, being the last line on the page, by the scholiast. In these instances the scholiast has employed no sign, the position of his lines making it evident that they belonged to the text; on f. 70 r. he adds Trach. 536 in the margin with the sign < at the end of it, to which another <

above line 537 corresponds: f. 79 r. at the end of the Trachiniae, the eighth *ἆθλον ἡρακλέους* is added in minuscule between the lines by the scholiast: f. 96 v. the lines at the bottom of the page, *εἰπὲ—ποῦ ἡ χθὲς ἔβη* are in minuscule by the scholiast: f. 109 v. Oed. Col. 899 is added by the scholiast without a sign, f. 110 r. Oed. Col. 1105 is added in the margin by the scholiast, f. 112 r. Oed. Col. 1256, is added by the scholiast in the margin, with an erasure in the text between *δακρύσω* and *παῖδες*, as if the first scribe had written part of the omitted line there: f. 113 r. Oed. Col. 1375 added in margin by scholiast without a sign, f. 117 v. the three lines *εὗρες σοφόκλεις ἐν σοφοῖς μέγα κλέος* etc. are written below the text by the scholiast. For corrections in the text we may take 56 r. *κακοῖσ* ib. *ειρμοσμένα*, 56 v. *προσαύσηι*; the dots which are put at either end of these semiuncials serve apparently to distinguish them from glosses f. 32 r. a variant is itself corrected in the same way, *ἢ νηπιωι.*: further, f. 64 r Antig. 1327 *τ'ἀν* is remade by the scholiast, f. 111 v. Oed. Col. 1211 *τοῦ* and *χρηίζει* are added in the text by the scholiast: f. 117 r. Oed. Col. 1729 the erasure between *θέμις* and *δε πῶς*, and *ταδ'* above the line are the work of the scholiast. Many more instances of all these cases will be found in the Hellenic Society's facsimile.

There is still another series of marginal notes to be considered; a number of words that occur on the extreme margin of the page, and in many cases have been almost cut away by the trimmer: so f. 4 r. *ῥυτῆρε*...(Ajax 241), f. 5 r. *τὰ πράγη* (id. 347), f. 5 v. ...*κοπινέστατον* (ib. 381), ib....*ημα* (ib. 390), f. 7 r. *χάρισ χα...τίκτ*...(ib. 522), ib. *ἐπήνεσερ*...(ib. 536), f. 7 v. ...*σκήπτω* (ib. 566), f. 8 r. *αἴλι*...(ib. 627), f. 10 r. *ξ*...(ib. 786), f. 10 v....*νηι... νῆς* (ib. 820), ib....*ον...α* (ib. 853), f. 11 v. ...*τρά...σ* (ib. 914), f. 13 v. ... *φωνῶ σοι* (ib. 1089), ib. ...*χος ἄλλων* (ib. 1105), f. 14 r. *κακὸς κα...* (ib. 1177). f. 15 r. *ἐγκεκλειμεν...τὸ μηδὲν ὄν...* (Ajax 1274, 1275). The hand, which is always minuscule, is I think the same as that of the scholiast; it is less formal and regular than his minuscule when he is correcting the text or adding variants, but on prolonged comparison it will be seen to

be very like the smaller specimens of that sort, and the less careful writing corresponds to the apparent character of these annotations. From the list of those on the Ajax that I have given, it will be seen that they are for the most part repetitions without comment of a word or words in the text: the reasons for such a proceeding might be various; from a comparison with the usage in Aeschylus, it seems likely that the annotator put down words that struck his eye in reading the author, as unusual in any way. In one or two cases in the Ajax the notes are slightly longer: e.g. f. 9 v. [κυ]δάζεται [ἀ]ντὶ τοῦ λοι[δορ]εῖται (Ajax 722), and f. 14 v. ...ὧν ὑπὲρ...δὲν ἀντέστης which seems to be a paraphrase of the line in the text (Ajax 1231): in these two cases the note takes the form of comment; one may perhaps suppose that in the other cases the intention of the annotation is exegetic, but that information failed the writer.

Aeschylus.

The title and argument to the Persae, and the person-names in the first gather, are by the first scribe, these latter however are added by the scholiast where they have been omitted, e.g. 121 r. where the $\overset{\circ}{\underset{\rho}{\chi}}$ of the first scribe may be contrasted with the ἄτοccα of the scholiast. F. 123 r. Pers. 394[1] ἠχώ· φόβος δὲ κτλ. is added by the schol. in the margin; f. 125 r. Pers. 555 Ξέρξης δὲ πάντ' ἐπέσπε κτλ. to 564 is added by the schol. in the margin, with the sign ≺ (this specimen of the scholiast's minuscule may be studied in the Florentine facsimile, fasc. I. tav. IX.: the first scribe no doubt omitted the lines from the homœoteleuton of ξέρξης δ' ἀπώλεσεν τοτοῖ and νᾶες δ' ἀπώλεσαν τοτοῖ): f. 126 r. Pers. 676, δ' is added by the scholiast above the line between διαγόεν and ἁμαρτία: ib. Pers. 699 πεπεισμένος is added in the margin by the scholiast. At 127 r. the second gather begins, and the text is in the hand of the second scribe[2]: the person-names are by the second scribe, but they are often omitted, and the scholiast supplies

[1] I quote the lines according to Wecklein's edition, Berlin 1885.

[2] The Palaeographical Society's facsimile, I. 83, gives a specimen of the second hand.

them: f. 134 r. in the instance already quoted, Agam. 293 κλυται, that the second scribe had written, is crossed out and ἀκρ written by the scholiast: f. 129 r. at the top of this page the first four ruled lines are left blank; in the margins the schol. writes *οὐ λείπει*: ib. Pers. 922 *κόσμου τ' ἀνδρῶν* added in marg. by the scholiast, while after 921 in the text there is a short line erased: 130 r. Pers. 991 *ἢ ἴυγγάμοι* in the marg. by the schol. in minuscule, ib. Pers. 1005 the scholiast in semiuncial *ἢ καὶ ακρόται ἐξοῦ ἔσται κτλ.*, f. 130 v. Pers. 1011 *πεπλήγμεθ' οἵαι δι' αἰῶνος τύχαι* added in minuscule by the scholiast, to which itself a variant of *δαίμονος τύχαι* is added in semiuncial: ib. Pers. 1047, *χάριν* is added by the scholiast in the margin: f. 131 r. the colophon of the Persae and the title to the Agamemnon are by the second scribe; f. 133 v. Agam. 112—114 *ξύμφρονου* to *αἶαν* are written in the text with no sign of erasure, by the scholiast: there must therefore have been a blank, and we see why above, f. 129 v., *οὐ λείπει* is written by the scholiast where there is no omission: f. 134 r. Ag. 263 after *τὸ μέλλον*, the scholiast adds *τό δὲ προκλίειν* in the text: f. 195 v. Ag. 1120 *ιει* in *φαιδρύνει* is added in the text by the scholiast: ib. Ag. 1115 κ (i.e. *Κασάνδρα*) is added in the margin by the scholiast: f. 140 r. Choeph. 382 *ἄτην*, the alpha being written by the scholiast in the same fashion as the corrections in Sophocles: f. 140 v. Choeph. 460 *κραίνετ' εὐδίκως* in the marg. by the scholiast, who also makes an erasure in the text: f. 141 v. Choeph. 521 in the text *παρειγάρ*, the *ει*, and later *τ* in *τὸν-* are the work of the scholiast, in the margin is *ἢ παρῆσ* by the second scribe, a very unusual occurrence: f. 142 v. Choeph. 625 *ἐπ ἀνδρὶ τευχεσφορωι* schol. in marg.: f. 143 v. Choeph. 708—710 *πρόσφορα* added by scholiast in the margin, with at the end the mark ⩽ to which ⩽ before *αἰνῶ* answers; the cause of the omission is evidently homoeoteleuton: f. 145 r. Choeph. 851 *ἦεν θνήσκοντος* by the schol. in the margin, and also written into the text by the scholiast: f. 145 r. the colophon to the Choephoroe is by the second scribe, but the argument etc. to the Prometheus is by the scholiast: f. 147 v. Prom. 9 at the

scholion τὸ $\bar{\chi}$ διὰ τὸ $\overline{\sigma\phi}\epsilon$, a small χ is actually written against the line, apparently by the scholiast, (Prof. Vitelli thinks by the second scribe); f. 148 r. Prom. 15 τῆι in text, over which the schol. writes προσ: f. 156 v. Prom. 844 add. in marg. schol. ib. Prom. 851 εν in ἐκμεμόχθηκεν add. schol.: ib. Prom. 856 αἰπυνωτ^{τόν}, τόν add. schol.: f. 158 v. Prom. 1033 ᾗ αλλ' ἐρεῖν μάτην schol. in marg. F. 159 r. the colophon and ornaments to the Prom. are by the second scribe, the argument etc. to the Eumenides by the scholiast, the person-names in the play by the second scribe: f. 160 v. Eumen. 121—123 added by the scholiast in the margin, with < at the end, to which < above ὤζει corresponds: f. 163 r. Eumen. 390 the line ταν ηλίω λαμπαι δυσοδοπαίπαλα is added in marg. by the schol.: f. 167 r. Eumen. 848 τιμῶν$^{\cdot\alpha\cdot}$ δαμαι...ων$^{\cdot\alpha\nu\cdot}$, the scholiast superscribes ·α· and ·αν·: f. 169 r. the colophon to the Eumenides and the words ὑπόθεσις τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ θήβας are by the second scribe in semiuncial; the letters are very remarkably formed, and the place is a decisive proof that the second hand and the scholiast are different; cf. also the colophon to S. c. Th. and the title of the Supplices. F. 179 r. the dramatis personae at the beginning of the Septem c. Thebas are by the scholiast, the person-names to the text are added by the scholiast where the second scribe has left them out: f. 170 r. S. c. T. 73 ᾗ καὶ ὅλβον ῥέοντα καὶ δόμους, schol.: ib. S. c. T. 83 in ἐλεδεμας the scholiast inserts ν after μ, ib. S. c. T. 123 μαχανᾶ$^{\text{H}}$ both H added by schol., ib. S. c. T. 124 φόνων$^{\beta ου}$, βου by schol.: f. 171 r. S. c. T. 178 τῆς is added by the second scribe above the line, ib. S. c. Th. 194 the letters ἐν κυ in the words πουντίω ἐν κύματι are by the schol. in an erasure, and there are a great many other corrections by the scholiast of accents and syllables in this part of the book: f. 174 r. S. c. T. 496 ἀνδρὶ is added above the line by the second scribe: f. 179 r. Suppl. 9 υλα in φυλαξανορ̣αν is by the scholiast in an erasure, marg. ᾗ φυξάνορ̣αν schol. F. 179 r. Suppl. 81 ἦβαι in text, τήνδε in marg. by the scholiast: f. 183 v. Suppl. 527—529 added by schol. in margin: f. 188 r. the ornaments at the end of the Supplices are by the second scribe, and this subscription at the bottom of the

page + *τέλος δεδωκὼς χριστὲ σοὶ χάριν φέρω*: Ff. 188 v. and 189 r. the *βίος αἰσχύλου* which covers these two pages, is by the scholiast, in a larger and rounder minuscule than what he uses on the margin of the text: it is proportioned to the greater space and the fact that the scribe is now writing the substantive text and no longer subordinate matter. In this respect it resembles the scholiast's minuscule on two pages of Apollonius (256, 260). This selection of additions and corrections may be sufficient to shew the part taken by the third hand in the writing of Aeschylus: I have made the list shorter because of the exact manner in which every case is recorded by Prof. Vitelli in Wecklein's edition of Aeschylus (Berlin 1885).

Next to be considered are the annotations on the extreme margin of Aeschylus. We do not find single words as in the Sophocles, but, apparently as an equivalent, the contraction ζ̣, for *ζήτει*, against particular verses: e.g. f. 140 v. against Choeph. 437, 439, 441, f. 141 r. against Choeph. 472, f. 141 v. Choeph. 519, 521, 530, 542, f. 170 r. S. c. Th. 83 where the word *ἐλεδεμας* is corrected by the scholiast into *ἐλεδεμας*̣. Either, as in these cases, the sign ζ̣ is written simply, or the word in question to which it is directed is added, as f. 131 r. Agam. 3 ζ̣ *ἄρκα*, or the ζ̣ is an introduction to a comment, e.g. f. 162 v. Eumen. 331 ζ̣ *οἶμαι φρονοδαήσ*, f. 182 v. Suppl. 435 ζ̣ *οιμαι μητιτλαίησ τὰν ἱκέτιν*: or we have a comment in the same style but without ζ̣, e.g. f. 133 v. Agam. 124 *οἶμαι εὖ νικάτω*, f. 140 r. Choeph. 408 *οἶμαι πᾶι τίς τράποι τ'ἄν· ὦ Ζεύ*, f. 140 v. Agam. 434 *οἶμαι πατρὸς δ' ἀτίμωσσ' ἀρ ἀτίσει*, f. 142 r. Choeph. 588 *οἶμαι πέδουροι ἵν' ἢ τὸ σημαινόμενον μετέωροι*, f. 161 v. Eumen. 204 *οὑτως* [ϑ, not ζ̣] *οἶμαι δέκτωρ*, f. 181 r. Suppl. 254 *οἶμαι ἢ ἑρμοῦ ῥαβδον*, f. 187 r. Suppl. 950 *ἴσως γ αὐτὸς χ' οἱ ξυνεμ*̣. These longer passages at once serve to identify the hand that writes them, and to explain the single words in the margin of Sophocles: they plainly belong to the same series of annotation, and the same purpose seems to be served by the *ζήτει* in Aeschylus as by the particular word in Sophocles: they call attention to something that the writer found a diffi-

culty in the text. Without further indication, the nature of the difficulty might be doubted, e.g. the sign might conceivably have implied a doubt as to whether the archetype had been properly copied. From the longer comments in the Aeschylus however, we see that the writer put down his doubts as a reader, at places where the text appeared to him not to make sense: he suggests a reading *ἵν' ἦ τὸ σημαίνομενον*....Further, while all these words, signs and comments plainly belong to the same writer, the longer comments enable us to identify him with the scholiast. The single words in the Sophocles-margin, having apparently no value, have often been cut through by the binder, and where they remain, their position on the edge has often exposed them to damp and rubbing, and distorted or obliterated the letters. The longer passages in Aeschylus, being better preserved by being further within the page, may be easily compared with the various lections added by the scholiast, and the hand in either case is seen to be the same. The evidence from Apollonius may conveniently be noticed here: the signs are fewer, but we have an equivalent (ν̇) for *ζήτει* on f. 199 r. at Ap. I. 693, and in other places. The consideration of these extra-marginal notes is of importance as throwing light on the arrangement of the manuscript, and also as giving a parallel to very similar extreme-marginalia in the Venetian Iliad, in which I may refer to Ludwich, Aristarchs Homerkritik, I. p. 160 sqq.

Apollonius.

F. 190 r. bk I. title and argument are by the scholiast, but the colophon to bk I. and the title to bk II. (f. 207 v.), to bk III. (f. 224 v.), and to book IV. (f. 241 v.) are by the first scribe. f. 191 v. (I. 139) *δ'* after *Ἰδμὼν* is added in the text by the schol. f. 194 v. the line I. 312 is added between the lines by the schol. in minuscule. f. 198 v. (I. 698), *π καὶ περιτελλομένου ἔτεος* schol. in minuscule. f. 200 v. the line I. 771 is inserted by the scholiast in the text between 769 and 770, ib. I. 802 *μῆτισ̌, ν* by schol. f. 201 v. I. 893 *ἑοῖ, ·τοι·* by schol. ib. *ἀγείράσ*, marg. *ἀγείραισ* schol. f. 202 r. I. 955 *ἐννεησ, αί* by schol., ib. I. 960 added in

minuscule by the schol. in marg., and before the scholia, which are written round it. f. 203 r. I. 1041 δ' after *σφόδριν* added in text by the scholiast. f. 204 v. I. 1155 omitted in the text, is added by the scholiast in minuscule in the margin. f. 207 r. I. 1333 *ἦκεν*, suprascr. schol. *ηϝ ειλεν*. f. 209 r. II. 110 on the margin and partly cut off, in a minuscule hand which seems none of the three already known, *ὡρείδης δ' ἀμύκ...βίησ ὑτ... πλος ὀπά*...f. 215 v. II. 624 *ταῦτα* is added by the first scribe above the line. f. 220 v. II. 1018 added by the scholiast in the margin with the sign <. f. 237 v. III. 1047 *ανδρων* is added above the line by the first scribe. f. 237 v. III. 1110 *οὐσα* corr. by first scribe into *ὅσσα*. f. 243 v. IV. 137 *σφισὶν* corr. by first scribe. These examples taken from many, may give an idea of the shares taken by the first scribe and the scholiast in presenting the author. We have now to see the scholiast as a corrector on a larger scale: f. 236 v. III. 921 is followed in the text by 962: after 921 the scholiast puts the sign ※ and in semiuncial the remark *ζη τὸ λεῖπον ἄνω ὅπου τὸ σημεῖον*; the *σημεῖον*, ※, recurs on the top margin, and is followed by the lines 922—961, written by the scholiast in minuscule; at the end is the sign ὁ· which refers the reader to another ὁ· which stands in the text before 962. The next correction is of larger extent: f. 250 v. after IV. 691 there follow in the text lines 722—752, after which stand 692—721, and then the remainder in order: this is all the work of the first scribe, which the scholiast sets in order thus. At v. 691 there is an asterisk, ※, and two explanatory notes, one in the left margin, partly cut off, as follows[1]: *δεῖ γινώσκειν ὅτι πρὸς περισσοτέραν δήλωσιν τὴν ἑκάστου σφαλ[μ]ατος σύναψιν [ἐ]ξω προσεθήκαμεν, ὥστε ῥα[δ]ίαν ποιεῖσθαι [τ]ην τούτων συνέ[π]ειαν καὶ μὴ [ἀ]ρὰς κατὰ τοῦ γρα[φ]εως ποιεῖσθαι*: this like the other explanatory notes is in semiuncial. In the right margin there is a longer note, *κατὰ λήθην συνέβη γραφῆναι οὕτως. δεῖ οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τούτου τοῦ στίχου ζητεῖν ἐν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν καταβατῷ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν, ὅπου τὸ σημεῖον· ἡδὲ τοῦ ζητουμένου στίχου ἀρχή ἐστιν οὕτως· ἴζανον ἥ τε δίκη· συνάπτειν οὖν δεῖ οὕτως, τῷ δ'*

[1] These notes are printed in Merkel's Apollonius, p. 241 sq.

ἄνεω καὶ ἄναυδοι ἐφ' ἕστιηι ἀίξαντε ἵζανον ἥτε δίκη λυγροῖς ἱκέτησι τέτυκται· διελθὼν δὲ μέχρι τοῦδε τοῦ στίχου αὖτως ἱδρύθησαν ἐφέστιοι ἦ γὰρ ὀνείρων· ἀναπόδισον αὖθις ἐν τῶ ἐαθέντι καὶ σύναψον οὕτω ἦ γὰρ ὀνείρων μνῆστις ἀεικελίη δύνεν φρένας ὁρμαίνουσα· εἶτα πάλιν διελθων μεχρι του οὐδ' ἄλοχον κρονίδαο διὸς λάθον, τοῦτον τὸν στίχον σύναψον τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν διαβὰς τοὺς ἐφεξης κειμένους· οὕτω δὲ δεῖ συνάπτειν· ἀλλά οἱ ἶρις πέφραδεν εὖτ' ἐνόησεν ἀπὸ μεγάροιο κίοντας· ἐν δὲ τῆ μιᾶ τούτων ἑκάστη συνάψει τὸ ἅρμοζον σημεῖον ἐθήκαμεν· καὶ δεῖ ταῦτα σκοπεῖν ἀκριβῶς μηδὲν τῶ γραφεῖ μεμφόμενον διὰ τὸ κακεῖνον οὕτως εὑρηκέναι καὶ τῶ σφάλματι δι' ἄγνοιαν μὴ προσσχεῖν. Pursuant to these directions, the reader finds another asterisk ※ on f. 251 r. before v. 692. At the end of the passage vv. 692—721 is the sign ⁂ with the instruction ζη τ ὄπιθεν ἐν τῶ προ τούτου καταβατῶ τὴν ἀκολούθησιν καὶ συνέπειαν του λόγου· ὅπου τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο. Looking back, the other specimen of this sign is on f. 250 v. before line 722. Continuing from here at line 751 we find the sign ⊕ with the note ζη τ τὸ σημεῖον ἔμπροσθεν πρὸ τριῶν στίχων του τέλους τοῦ καταβατοῦ: this sign we find at line 752, which is the third from the bottom of the page. The text then proceeds smoothly. The ordinary scholia are distinguished from these explanations by being enclosed in lines, e.g. on f. 250 v. and f. 251 r. Lastly, on a blank space at the bottom of f. 250 r. the scholiast, using minuscule, writes these rather enigmatical lines:

ἀρὰς ἔοικε τὸν κατεστυγημένον
βάλλειν ἀναιδεῖσ ὡς κεκιβδηλευμένον
ὡς μαινόβακχον καὶ λίαν πεφυρμένον
ὡς πατραλοίαν καὶ κατηλισγημένον
εἰ καὶ φυλάττοις αὐτὸς ὡς θεοῦ φίλος
τοῦ μὴ κατεχθρῶν β΄..ρεως πέμπειν λόγους.

I am unable to read the first syllable of the fourth word in the last line. Merkel prints *βίρεως*, the word certainly appears to begin with *β*, but the vowel that should follow is represented by a single stroke of no particular significance. So far as the

lines have any meaning, they seem intended to support the prayer *καὶ μὴ ἀρὰς κατὰ τοῦ γράφεως ποιεῖσθαι.*

In the same quaternion as this correction, on f. 252 v. we find line 849 followed by l. 950, and the passage continuing so that the next page (the actual f. 254 r.) began with 974, that is to say exactly one hundred lines were omitted. To remedy this, an extra leaf or half-sheet is inserted between the seventh and eighth: viz. f. 253, the flap of which is visible between ff. 246 and 247; the writing on this leaf, text and scholia, is all in the hand of the scholiast: further, on f. 252 the lines 950—973, which had been mistakenly added, are cancelled, first by a lunette or semicircle being prefixed to each line (ↄ), next a hand, apparently later, has scored lines cross-wise across the passage. Further, on the top of f. 254 r., immediately above the text, two lines, 972 and 973, are added, that is to say, the first scribe having omitted a hundred lines, the scholiast, finding them too many to write in the margin, inserted one entire leaf on which to write them: at the same time he marked out the twenty-four lines that were out of place on f. 252 v. and had therefore 124 lines to insert. Of these he wrote 54 on the recto of f. 253, 68 on the verso, writing close and in double columns towards the bottom: but even so, two lines remained, which he added above the text of f. 254 r.

In the next gather, on f. 255 v. after l. 1097 comes 1123 to 1147, after which is 1098 and the page continues to 1113: the scholiast has cancelled the lines 1123—1147 with double marks of omission (ↄↄ, the outer set of which seem to me in a different hand), then he has cut away f. 256 altogether and inserted a new leaf, the actual f. 256, which is gummed to f. 261; f. 257, in the first hand, begins with 1174, so that fewer lines than usual were necessary to fill up the gap. Accordingly in the recto of 256 we have 32 lines and on the verso 28, while the average of the lines in Apollonius is 42. To account for one page containing so few lines that the next page begins with 1174, we must suppose some confusion or repetition in the original f. 256, which is unknown to us. Again, f. 260, the sixth leaf is inserted and written by the scholiast: here there is no disturbance in the pages that precede or follow, but

evidently a number of lines must have been omitted on the original f. 259, for on the recto of the restored leaf we have 70 lines, on the verso 62, and the lower part of the recto is in double columns.

The method of rearranging a discontinuous text by means of a system of signs, is common in late MSS., and is in itself a practicable arrangement. So we find that in the beautiful tenth-century Pappus, Vat. 218, the quires stand in a wrong order, and are adjusted by a late scribe, who calls himself Zacharias, in the same way: in the eleventh-century MS. of Dio Cassius, Ven. 395, a late hand has frequent warnings to the reader in the text; e.g. f. 202 r. at the beginning of a gather, *ζήτει ὁ ἀναγινώσκων το παρὸν τετράδιον ἐν ἄλλω τόπω ὀφεῖλον τεθῆναι ὃ γὰρ τὰς βεβράνας συντιθεὶς ἠστόχησεν*; this is a matter of gathers, not of mistakes in copying by the original scribe; *ὁ συντιθεὶς τὰς βεβράνας* is evidently a would-be rearranger of the book after its binding had burst: at the end of this and the next gather we find the indication $\zeta\overset{\tau}{\eta}$, on f. 198 r., the first page of a quire of two sheets, we have $\zeta\overset{\tau}{\eta}$ *δίφυλλον*[1].

. These however are cases of books that have become disturbed and have required rearranging many years after their writing: rearrangements in the text of an eleventh-century MS. at the time when it was written, are unusual. The reader will find another instance of a direction to look out for *σημεῖα* in the page of the Paris Anthology facsimiled by M. Omont (facsimilés des plus anciens MSS. no. 33). The different procedure adopted in different cases by the scholiast is also worthy of notice: here he sets matters right by writing omitted lines in the margin, with a direction to the reader where to look for them: there he does not rewrite, but corrects a disjointed text by a number of corresponding signs: in another case the omitted lines are so many that the margin will not

[1] Compare also Bodl. Barocci 69, A.D. 1378; on f. 155 v. in the margin we find *ζήτει εἰς τὸ τέλος τῆς ὁράσεως* [= page], and below $\zeta\overset{\tau}{\xi}$ *ἔμπροσθεν δύο φύλλων τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο* ⊕. F. 157 v. (which is blank but for one line) $\zeta\overset{\tau}{\xi}$ *ὄπισθεν δύο φύλλων*. Cf. also f. 190 r.

contain them, and it is judged better to insert a new leaf which closely written will contain the omitted lines: in other places the leaves on which mistakes have happened are cut out and written anew. The most interesting point however in the third hand's correction is the apology that on f. 250 v. he makes for the blunders of the first writer. It is of the utmost rarity, in a MS. of a good age, for a scribe to break his impersonality and speak in his own person: and I know no instance of one scribe referring to another of his companions. In our case, the third scribe apologises for his subordinate: *δεῖ ταῦτα σκοπεῖν ἀκριβῶς* he says of his system of signs, *μηδὲν τῷ γραφεῖ μεμφόμενον*; and the reason he gives for such pardon is interesting, "because he found it so and did not attend to the mistake." In the study of MSS. we are so entirely reduced to inference, that an explicit statement of this kind is of great value. Also one sees that according to the standard of an eleventh-century scribe, verses added in the margin, pages cut out, lines erased or struck out, needed no excuse: it was only when the text as presented to the reader, was not of itself continuous, that he felt it necessary to explain, and to deprecate complaint. Late scribes, e.g. of the XVIth century, lament freely the laceration or the unintelligibility of their archetypes: but a scribe of a good age is usually silent.

A certain number of the scholia to Apollonius were in the process of copying written on the wrong page: the scholiast warns the reader of the fact in the following way. F. 196 r. the note on line I. 498, which is the first line on f. 196 v., is on the recto of the leaf: accordingly in the margin we find *του ἐκεῖθεν καταβατοῦ σχόλιον*, "the scholion belongs to the page over there": f. 206 r. the scholion on I. 1280 which should be on the verso is on the recto of this leaf; in the margin we have, *σχόλιον του ἐκεῖθεν σελιδος*. F. 244 v. the scholion on IV. 247 should come on f. 245 r., it is on the verso of 244. The margin has the note *ταυτα τὰ σχολια του ἑτέρου εἰσὶ καταβατοῦ*. On f. 245 r. at the bottom we have *ζη τὰ λοιπὰ σχολια τούτου τοῦ καταβατου στρέψας τὸ φύλλον*. Καταβατὸν is late Greek for 'page'; according to Stephanus the earliest authority for it

is Herodian, Epimerismi (ed. Boissonade, London 1819) p. 2 *ὅρα καὶ ἐν τοῖς μετωπίοις τῶν καταβατῶν*, and the word is recognised by Hesychius and Suidas. The more usual word in classical Greek is *σελίς*, which is used as an equivalent of *καταβατόν* on f. 206 r. Another mediaeval word for 'page' or 'side' is *ὄψις*[1]; e.g. in the xth century MS. of Clement Alex., Tatian and Athenagoras, at Modena, Estense 126, where a manuscript has been made up by writing a first part to fit a mutilated book already existing, at the end of the new part, which had overlapped the old by a page, the scribe writes *ζητει ἀθηναγορου πρεσβείαν περι χριστιανῶν ἐν τῇ β̄ ὄψει του φύλλου τοῦ ἐχομένου τετραδίου*; accordingly we find that the first page of the original book is crossed out, and the treatise of Athenagoras begins on the verso of the first leaf.

We are now able to reconstruct the process of the writing of the book. A single scribe had the direction of it: he numbered the quires, perhaps ruled the leaves, and gave them out to be written: the writing was done by two other men, apparently younger than the director, of whom the first wrote the whole of Sophocles and Apollonius, while at the second quire of Aeschylus a second scribe was taken on who completed the author. The duty of these men was to copy the text of their author, with all that immediately appertained to it, the titles and colophon of the play, the names prefixed to the parts of the characters, the arguments introductory to the plays. The first scribe fulfilled this duty accurately, the second, for reasons that are not obvious, in places contented himself with the bare text, and we find therefore many of these appendages in the case of Aeschylus in the hand of the director. The two subordinates very seldom correct their own mistakes; and they take no further part in the making of the book. The director, or as we may call him, the diorthotes, received the sheets as written, and his first care was to compare the text with the archetype, and to add lines or passages of the text that had been left out by the two scribes. Where necessary, he had recourse to strong remedies, and cut away and added pages.

[1] Another word is *ὄρασις*, cf. the notes from Barocci 69 just quoted.

He also found it necessary to introduce a new system of marking the quires in Aeschylus, to repair an inexplicable error of his own. He then proceeded to write, in the prepared spaces, the scholia that he found in the margin of his archetype, using a different character to distinguish the comments from the texts of the authors, but writing various readings in the ordinary minuscule. Finally, he appears to have read the book through in a more critical spirit, more as a reader than a scribe, and to have put down on the margin where it was free and in small character, either words which he doubted and for which he had no explanation, or in other cases a sign to attract the reader's attention to such words: or occasionally he ventured on a note, an expression of opinion as we should say, a conjecture of his own. This completed the book, it needed only to be made up and bound. At some period, probably later than the original binding, the leaves of the book were re-trimmed, and many of the diorthotes' queries were cut away. The scholia were spared, and in one place f. 199 v., where they spread nearer to the bottom of the page than usual, the last quarter of an inch of scholia is turned up into a fold. In the course of time, at a period which nothing in the book itself enables us to fix, the quires of Aeschylus became unsewn, and one whole one, and three quarters of the next were lost.

T. W. ALLEN.

VISIO PAULI[1].

Mr James is to be congratulated on his successful raid among a few libraries, from which he has enriched apocryphal literature with no fewer than thirteen new documents, some indeed consisting only of a few lines.

Perhaps the most interesting piece is the first, from an eighth century manuscript now in the National Library, Paris (*nouv. acq. Lat.* 1631). It is a vision of the world unseen, like the two in Bede, and has been known in other forms, Greek, Syriac, etc., but the new comer is the most complete of all. I propose to run through it, noticing forms and constructions interesting to students of late Latin and of the Romance languages. The scribe has an 'open mind' on many points, 'in all things mutable save mutability', and by his interchange of consonantal *i* (j) and *g*, shews that *g* in his days was no longer hard; as the forms of *habeo, homo* and *hic,* very often drop the aspirate, he places us by the cradle of modern French and Italian.

P. 11 l. 10 11 habitante quodam in domum. So 19 9 inhabitabam in eam. 21 26 ueniet habitare in eam. cf. 16 16 omnia steterunt in conspectum eius. 16 19 20 impii non inuenerunt locum habitacionis in eum. 20 2 adhuc reputas in seculum permanere? 21 14 15 (cf. 35 33) cuius rei gratiam. 25 14 the correct *cuius rei gratia.* 21 15 posite sunt aec litere super tabulas istas. 27 2 quis est super tronum? 27 8 coram dominum. 30 18 qui sunt in hanc penam. 30 33 <uidi> ...in medium illius. 32 19 constitutos in foueam. 33 7 pannis

[1] Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson, B.D. Vol. II No. 3. Apocrypha anecdota by Montague Rhodes James, M.A. Cambr. University Press. 1893.

picem plenis et sulforem ignis. 34 35 de celum. 39 10 de mundum. 36 10 pendens in crucem. 36 30 uermes qui sub nos sunt. 41 32 habuit in semetipsum. As we have 22 26 *cum omnes sanctos suos*, I retain the acc. 35 22 *cum dilectissimum Paulum*; and l. 28 arborem a uentum comotam. The acc. even takes the place of nom. 20 28 nondum completum est annum. Compare Petron. 58 uidebo te in publicum.

P. 11 l. 12 fundamenta domus dissolueret. 15 coegit eum ut dissolueret fundamentum. Not a very common use of *dissoluo*.

P. 11 l. 17 gallicole eius in quibus ambulabat docens uerbum domini. *gallicula* cited hitherto from Jerome and from a glossary. Add Rufin. Ioseph. ant. IV 8. martyr. Perpet. 3 2 *bis*. p. 76 3 and 17 Robinson. Quicherat add. lexx. lat. Greg. Magn. dial. I 2 (uar. lect.).

P. 11 l. 19 secundum eo quod. I find *sic...secundum quod* in Cypr. 713 16 Hartel. *secundum quod...secundum hoc* (= *καθό... κατὰ τοῦτο*) in Iren. II 28 2 4. 29 1. IV 36 6 f. 38 1. *secundum quod* without verb in Tert. adu. Marc. III 6 f. Benoist and Goelzer in their new dict. Lat. Fr. have other exx. *eo quod* is common; but a combination of the two (instead of *secundum id quod*) is new to me.

P. 12 l. 4 (of mankind) imperat autem omni facture, et plus quam omnis natura peccat. 22 33 uidi creaturam loci illius et omnem facturam dei. Cf. Rönsch Itala u. Vulgata 329. Paucker spicilegium 271. Aug. serm. 34 1. 141 1. Clem. recogn. III 11. 8 ter. V 16 f. 22 bis. VIII 20 bis. 34 f. 58 f. Iren. I 24 1. II 26 3 f. 30 3 9 ter. 34 3. 35 1. IV 38 1. V 1 1. 12 2. 36 3. Mar. Victorin. adu. Arium I 45. Hier. ep. 98 14. id. Didym. sp. s. 11. id. in ep. ad Eph. I 1 (Ven. 1769 VII 548[b]) uolens itaque Paulus ostendere quod Deus uniuersa sit machinatus ex nihilo, non *conditionem*[1], non *creaturam* atque *facturam*, sed *καταβολήν*, id est *initium fundamenti* ad eum rettulit. II 4 (ib. 626[e]) creatio quippe apud nos *generatio* uel *natiuitas* dicitur: apud Graecos uero sub nomine creationis uerbum *facturae* et *conditionis* accipitur.

[1] This *conditio* (*condo*) is not to be confounded with the classical *condicio* (*condico*).

Phoebad. fil. diu. 3. Cassian. inc. v 3. Rufin. in Gen. i 12. Vict. Vit. ii 69. passio sanct. iv coronat. 326 21. 330 24. 334 23.

P. 12 l. 11 12 dum ad usque conuertentes peniteantur. I have not observed *dum ad usque* (cf. *quo ad usque*) elsewhere; here it occurs also l. 20, 29, 35. 13 16. 17 6. 40 6. The depon. *peniteamini* also 18 18. 41 24: the personal act. *peniteant* l. 21, 29. 13 16. 14 30. *penitere* 35 15. *penitebant* 24 29. *penituistis* 36 8 and 9. *penituerunt* 25 11. On the depon. see Kretschmann de latinitate Apulei 81. On *-eo, -eor, -endus, -ens*, Koffmane Geschichte des Kirchenlateins i (Breslau 1879) 70. Rufin. apol. i 44 si ille pro his paenituit. Tert. adu. Marc. ii 24 *ante med.* paenitentem malitiarum.

P. 12 l. 23 intaminauerunt homines sanctum nomen tuum. Georges and Benoist-Goelzer know the verb; Freund (Riddle-White, Lewis-Short) only the participle. See Hegesipp. ii 10 4 ne templum intaminarent (cf. Ioseph. bell. ii 17 5 *τοὺς μιαίνοντας τὸν ναόν*). The adv. *intaminate* is in Iren. ii 10 § 2.

P. 12 l. 24 permitte me exurgam. l. 8 permitte me et faciam. 13 12 permitte mihi et conteram. 30 6 non permiserunt eum dicere. 23 26 non omnis homo permittetur ingredi. 32 3 non permittebantur sumere. 32 24 non permittebantur dicere. Aug. de pecc. meritis i 66 f. aetas permissa maledicere. Amm. xiv 1 3 nec hiscere nec loqui permissus.

P. 13 l. 3 (and 10 and p. 30 l. 18) noceor. 39 8 nocetur. 31 36 uiduas et pauperes nocuerunt. Hence in p. 21 l. 27 *nocemur* (ms. *uocemur*) is a certain correction; *uexamur* did not even deserve the honour of a query in the note. Benecke on Iustin xliv 4 6. Burm. and Gud. on Phaedr. iv 18 (19) 4. Iren. v 5 2. Hermas mand. x 1 2. Aug. de gestis Pelag. 33. Greg. Tur. glor. mart. i 31. Rönsch Ital. u. Vulg. 441. Hier. in Gal. i 2 (on c. 3 1 vii 417[d]) uel is, in quo bona sint aliqua, alio fascinante, id est inuidente, noceatur. (ib.[e]) tenera aetas noceri dicitur fascino. Archiv f. lat. Lexik. i 265. Hagen on vulg. p. 33. Vict. Vit. ii 37. [Cypr.] iii 319 ver. 261 and 264 Hartel. dig. xliii 19 3 2. Veg. iii 26 p. 119 13.

P. 13 l. 20 incessabiliter. Add to lexx. Rufin h. e. vi 17 f. h. mon. 12. Cassian. coll. xiv 10 4. xxi 14 2. Aug. in

ps. 93 23. Oros. I 2 106. VI 20 7. VII 4 16. 25 13. 41 4. Beda h. e. I 6 f. II 11. Eddius uita Wilfr. 48. Baron. A. D. 601 13. Migne LII 739d. Ennod. ep. VI 38 f. Leo ep. 108 (83) c. 2 (I 1012a Migne).

P. 13 l. 34 indeficienter. Add to lexx. Hil. in ps. 118 l. 13 2. Fulgent. c. Fastidios. 14. c. Fab. fr. 6 cet. Bonif. p. 223 Jaffé. [Aug.] serm. 2 ad catech. 13. [Hil.] anon. in Iob I p. 23. Rönsch 153.

P. 14 l. 12 conlugemus. A rare word. I have recorded no other example except the one to be seen in lexx.

P. 14 l. 16 (cf. 17 4) adiutorium. Freund's effrontery in calling this word, which exists in medical and theological writings in hundreds of examples, 'rare', is only equalled by the submissive ignorance of Riddle-White and Lewis-Short who still repeat the fable. Take a few exx. Pollio in Suet. gr. 10 p. 108 Reiff. VM. II 7 E 1 cet. Sen. ben. II 23 3. VI 35 2. ira I 5 2. ep. 52 3. 87 25, 31. Tert. adu. Marc. I 8 a. m. II 4 p. m. 11 pr. quae in -um masculo...fuerat designata. Saluian. eccl. III 13. Cassian. inst. XII 14 1. 17 1 bis. 18 pr. coll. III 12 3 4. 16 3. 22 3. XXI 33 1. (Petschenig is so well aware that the word is no rarity, that he gives it no place in his index.) It would be easy to collect examples from fifty writers, and fifty examples from some single writers. From Theodore Priscian alone I glean 124 references. Why should men who take money from a confiding public for teaching Latin proclaim on the house tops that they have never opened the elder Seneca, Frontinus, Apuleius, any father or medical writer? It is the fashion to display ignorance of the Bible; can we conceive Rob. Stephens, or Faber, or Gesner, or Scheller, or Forcellini, calling a word 'rare' which occurs 39 times in the concordance to the Vulgate? Rönsch gives it no place in his book, though he finds room for many words not marked as 'rare' by Messrs Freund, Riddle, White, Lewis, Short[1]. Half an hour with Augustine will enable

[1] Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours 465, only thinks it worth while to record three examples out of many in Gregory, pointing out that *adiumentum*, as obsolete, is in Placidus explained by *adiutorium*.

any student to take the measure of these gentlemen as regards a right to lay down the law of Latin usage.

P. 14 l. 32 quecunque operantur a uobis. See Georges for *opero* and the passive *operor*. Add Isid. sent. III 19 4. Rönsch Itala u. Vulg. 298. 388.

P. 15 l. 12 exiebant. Neue Formenlehre II 445. act. apost. 8 7 old Lat. Migne CVI 1291[d]. Lucifer p. 4 l. 7 Hartel.

P. 16 l. 6 obmixta. Unknown to lexx. In Apul. met. IV 20 introduced by Hildebrand from the mss. and retained (*se obmiscent agminatim*) by Eyssenhardt.

P. 16 l. 20 21 dominati sunt anime eius. Like *regno* and *desino* in Horace, *dominor* occasionally follows the Gr. construction. Apul. Asclep. 39. Tert. apol. 26 f. adu. Marc. IV 27 p.m. pudic. 17. Minuc. 12 5. Herm. past. III 9 23. Hier. ep. 125 11. in Ioel c. 2 (VI 194[a] ed. Ven. 1768). Rönsch Itala u. Vulg. 438. gen. 37 8 Lugd. Ezech. 46 18. Migne XC 131[d]. Iren. III 6 1, 4. 16 3 f. 18 2. 23 4. IV 1 1 bis. Possibly however *animae* may be dative.

P. 16 l. 23 necesse est enim te reuertere in eodem corpore. 18 l. 10 n. e. e. te r. in carne tua. Georges adds to the stock exx. (Lucr. and Pompon.) of the present used intransitively only Aug. serm. 194 5 Mai. I have not recorded any example.

P. 17 l. 14 uiuificatio. The substantive is less common than the verb. See however Cypr. de domin. orat. 12 f. (275 19 Hartel). Ambr. hexaëm. V 1 bis. in ps. 37 39. Nicet. de spir. s. potentia (Migne LII 858[c]) 9 f.

P. 18 l. 3 *hora* and *ora* in a single line.

ibid. minabatur. Fr. *mener*. It. *menare*. gl. Reichenau col. 33 157. abigebat: inde minabat. See Georges. Rönsch Itala u. Vulgata 236 and coll. philol. 234. Arch. f. lat. Lexik. IV 293 f. Sen. contr. 9 8 ceteros patres nostros, quos apud aratra ipsa minantes pecora sua circumsteterunt lictores. Greg. M. dial. I 2 (157[a]). Bonif. p. 280 p. m. Jaffé. Migne XCVI 827[c]. leges Burgund. (von Salis) 63 1. 115 12.

P. 18 l. 7 comminati sunt ipsius. I have no record of this construction.

P. 18 l. 12 ait ad illam. 27 10 ad alterutrum dicunt. *ad* after *aio*. Apul. met. V 18 f. sic ad illas ait. Clem. recogn.

I 20 pr. II 71 pr. 47 pr. 69 pr. VII 1. 4 pr. 6 pr. VIII 8 bis. IX 1 pr. 33. 34. X 16 f. 59 pr. 64. So after *inquit* Dosith. 38; after *donatum* Bonif. p. 260 f. Jaffé. On the use of *ad* after *mando, do*, cet. see Stünkel in Jahrbb. f. Philol. 1876. Suppl. 641—4. Thielmann über Sprache u. Kritik des Apolloniusrom. (Speier 1881) 37. Rönsch in roman. Forschungen I (1883) 286—7. *ad* after *dico* Tert. adu. Marc. IV 22 f. de carne Chr. 16 f. Lucifer (ed. Hartel) p. 61 l 4 17. 72 3. Clem. recogn. II 5 pr. 39 ter. III 32 pr. IV 23. VI 11. VIII 4. 98. X 13 pr. 54 pr. Bonnet Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours (Paris 1890) 583. With *loquor* we find *ad* in Verg. and Ov. Language becomes less synthetic; the force of terminations is forgotten, and prepositions or auxiliary forms make good the loss.

P. 18 l. 25 susurracio. Add to lexx. Cassian. inst. VII 9 3. X 20. See Georges.

ibid. obuiauerunt eam. I have a good many exx. of the verb, but not in this construction.

P. 18 l. 28 peculiaria nostra. See in Archiv f. lat. Lexik. II 38 39 *peculiare* as subst.

P. 18 l. 32 (23 3) miliorum. I have no record of this form.

P. 19 l. 11 facta est uox dei ad eam. Gell. III 23 20 seruus ...has apud Menandrum uoces facit. In the vulgate we have *factum est uerbum Domini ad me.*

P. 19 l. 17—19 quicunque enim fecerit misericordiam eius ipse miserebitur, et quicunque non misertus fuerit, neque ei miserebitur deus. 29 13 14 dicentes: Miserere nobis, domine: et nemo misertus est eis. cf. 32 24. 34 33. 35 1. 25—27 (e.g. miserere plasmae tuae, miserere filiis ominum, miserere imagini tue). 36 4. But 30 12[1] orfanos non est misertus. 33 16 orfanos non sunt miserti. For dat. see Cypr. 292 2 Hartel. Lact. m. p. 23 8. Hermae Pastor (ed. Hilgenfeld,

[1] As in both these passages *orfanos* is preceded in the ms. by *uiduae et*, it is doubtful whether we should read in both places the dat. or the acc., or retain the two cases. See for dat. Rönsch 313—4. Arch. f. lat. Lexik. VIII 175. Paucker in Zeitschr. f. oest. Gymn. 1881, 494. 1887, 96. In the sense of 'giving alms' Koffmane Gesch. d. Kirchenlateins I (Breslau 1879) 31.

Lips. 1873) uis. III 12 p. 29 6. Iren. I 3 2. III 17 3 f. 23 5 f. Lucifer 4 26. 58 8 Hartel. passio Perpetuae 2 1 pr. 2. 6 p. 70 12 Robinson. Aug. serm. 259 3 bis. Clem. recogn. III 42 f. Hier. VI (Ven. 1768) 9^{b}. 13^{a}. 63^{c}. 296^{a}. 297^{bd}. Beda h. e. III 12 f. hist. Apollon. Tyr. ind.

P. 19 l. 20 angelo tartarucho. 29 32 angelos tartarucos. The Greek (Tischendorf apocalypses apocryphae, 48, Lips. 1866) Ταρταροῦχος, so far as I know, here first assumes a Latin dress.

P. 19 l. 21 mittat eum in tenebris exterioribus. 20 36 anima ista in manibus Tartari tradatur. 21 1 ducat eam in carcere <?-em> inferiorum <?-em> et mittatur in tormentis. 21 11 12 si ingressus fueris in his portis. 22 9 10 induxit me in secundo caelo, et iterum duxit me in firmamento. 25 16 ingrediencium in ac ciuitate. 25 31 inducit eum in ciuitate. 31 26 miserunt eas in ceruicibus earum. 33 3 alios proiecerunt in flumine. 34 7 respexi in puteo. 38 13 ingressi sunt multi in regno.

P. 20 l. 13 hactos. so fructos (22 32, but in same l. fructus. 23 1. 35 17). Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours 357 cites *artos, grados, uersos, risos,* and from an inscr. A.D. 515 (Le Blant, Inscr. chr. 492) *aditos.*

ibid. ex quo caepit annorum .xv. cf. l. 15 ex quo ce<pit> .xv. esse annorum.

P. 21 l. 25 ilare uultu. Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, 359, cites the abl. forms *secure, site, grande,* cet.

P. 21 l. 32 ilarens et gaudens. No example of *hilarens* has been recorded. Add to lexx. Isid. orig. I 4 15 hilarisso. (I now see that the latest lexicon, Benoist-Goelzer, has this reference.)

P. 22 l. 3 unus et unus, 'one or two'. Siluia, peregrinatio ad loca sancta (1887) 77. 104. 107. Below 26 27 unus unum praecedit. 29 18 huna super hunam. This usage is unknown to lexx.

P. 23 l. 3 milia milia butriones et in miliorum his singuli butriones. Elsewhere we find the biblical *milia milium.* Compare Commod. apol. 806 multa milia gentes. cf. 853. After *miliorum* (for the form cf. 18 32) probably *milibus* has

fallen out. *butrio* is *botryo*. Several forms, but not this, may be seen in Georges.

P. 23 l. 7 fluenter prestat dona. Here *fluenter* evidently = *affluenter* (for which add to lexx. Iren. v 8 1. Greg. Tur. glor. mart. I 11 col. 734[e] ed. Ben. Ioseph. ant. IV 6 p. 105 pr. ed. Bas. 1524. affluentissime Aug. serm. 216 c. 4).

P. 23 l. 24 aque candide ualde desuper lac. Rönsch (Itala u. Vulgata 398) cites instances of *desuper* as a prep. Here it is used like *super*. 36 22 melius super; 41 33 plus super. So Iren. v 5 2 fortior super. Tert. adu. Marc. IV 20 pr. uastiori super. II 24 f. optimo super. CIL v 7780 super omnes felicissimo.

P. 23 l. 25 aceriosus lacus = Acherusius cf. l. 32. 24 1.

P. 24 l. 7 pirgi. Elsewhere the rare *pyrgus* is a dice-box; here a 'tower'.

P. 24 l. 21 22 esurierunt ab his. Wölfflin in Archiv f. lat. Lexik. I 411—2 has examples of *esurio* with acc. and with gen., also of the perf., though Freund and his followers say 'no perf.'

P. 24 l. 29 arbores ille...umiliantes semetipsos. 25 7 arbores humiliant se et iterum eriguntur. I have many exx. of *humilio* (see Bünemann on Lact. IV 18 22): in Greg. Tur. four exx. of *humiliatis capillis* occur (Hannover 1883, index p. 949 col. 1 l. 31); otherwise the literal sense is rare.

P. 24 l. 33 studenter. A new word. cf. cognoscenter, nolenter in Rönsch 151; desideranter in Chrysol. serm. 165. Ioseph. ant. (1524) 27 a. m.

P. 24 l. 35 36 nichilum facientes proximis. I thought of *proximos* 'making no account of their neighbours', as in 31 7 8 nihil facientes dominum et angelos eius; but 25 1 2 shews that the dat. is right: si quid faciebant aliquid proximo modicum, inflati erant.

P. 24 l. 36 amichabiliter. Add to lexx. [Cassiod.] de amicit. 3. schol. Vindob. in Hor. a. p. 411. [Hier.] ep. ad amic. aegr. I 4. Bonif. 269 Jaffé. Rönsch cites Nennius 46.

P. 25 l. 16 17 ingrediencium in ac ciuitate. See n. on 21 1.

P. 26 l. 1 qui seruiunt castitatem. Read *seruo*, not *seruio*, as Syr. has 'whoever has *kept* his virgin and the purity of his soul.'

P. 26 l. 5 ad aquilonem ciuitatis. This gen. is not perhaps very common. Josh. 17 9 terminus Manasse ab Aquilone torrentis. 2 chr. 32 30 ad occidentem urbis Dauid.

P. 26 l. 9 susceptores peregrinorum (cf. 13 susceptionem peregrinorum). See my glossary to Bede (-tio, -tor). Eugipp. uita Seuerini 1 5 senex, qui dudum in Asturis tanti hospitis susceptor exstiterat. Corp. gloss. II 194 1 susceptor ὑποδοχεύς.

P. 26 l. 25 est in ciuitate Christi murus praecedens in honore huic loco? but l. 27 unus unum praecedit. l. 28 unus alium praecedit. The dat. is cited from Plaut. The *alium* = alterum, as very often, e.g. Sulpic. perioch. Ter. Andr. 12. haut. 12. My glossary to Bede and my Lat. Heptateuch 103 31. 153 22.

P. 26 l. 28 obquare. (cf. 33 29 obquid.) A new word.

P. 26 l. 33 conuersus me. Nonius 480 21 acknowledges a depon. *conuertor*. Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, 413, cites *se sustentaretur, se trucidantur*.

P. 28 l. 6 compsallent. l. 9 compsallet. Benoist-Goelzer have introduced this word into lexx. (from [Cypr.] de XII abusiuis 11).

P. 28 l. 7 tricans. Rönsch 302. Hermas sim. 9 9 (127 16 Hilg.) quid te tricas? Bonif. 67 Jaffé. Hamann breuiloquus (Hamb. 1882) 31.

P. 28 l. 11 quieuit loqui. cf. 40 27. Holtze synt. II 44. Cassiod. hist. trip. X 33. XII 2.

P. 28 l. 13 recesse a locis. A new adverb.

P. 29 l. 3 fornicant. assumptio Mosis 5 (102 26 Hilg.) fornicabunt. cf. 31 22 mechauerunt.

P. 29 l. 20 subtussecuta. It is hardly safe to add this to lexx. as a new compound.

P. 29 l. 23 post multarum orarum. As *post* in the next line takes acc. probably *spatium* or *tempus* has fallen out.

P. 29 l. 32 ferrum trium angulorum. Unless *angulus* (cf. 'angler') means 'a hook', 'a prong', for which I know no evidence, we must read *ungularum*. Syr. 'an iron pitchfork and it had three tines'. The *angelos* in the neighbourhood would favour the corruption.

P. 29 l. 36 (cf. 30 28) istum quem uides presbyter fuit. 30 8 hunc quem uides episcopus fuit. Observe the attraction.

P. 30 l. 36 usuras usurarum. Iustin. cod. IV 32 28 bis.

P. 31 l. 20 mouechi. cf. fleueo (35 21. 39 18).

P. 31 l. 21 mechati sunt, but 32 mechauerunt. cf. 29 3 fornicant.

P. 31 l. 33 in locum glacie et niue. Probably *plenum* or *rigentem*, or some other acc., has fallen out.

P. 32 l. 1 super canela aque. See Ducange 'canela', 'canellus', which, rather than 'canalis', gave rise to our 'channel', 'kennel'.

P. 32 l. 36 nefanda ora† genitoribus nostris. On p. 186 Mr James says: "This should be *Vindica nos a g. n.*" True, the Gr. has: *ἐκδίκησον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν μητέρων ἡμῶν*, but, as I shewed in this Journal (XXI 285—6), *defensio* = *ἐκδίκησις*. Read therefore: *defende nos a g. n.*

P. 33 l. 2 dederunt nos . . . in conculcationem porcis. For *conc.* see Aug. in ps. 55 4. Ambr. in Luc. 10 28. Hier. in Matt. 4 6. in Is. VII (23 4 seq.). Rufin. in Iesu Naue 21 1. Rönsch 70.

P. 33 l. 26 uocati estis nomen domini. I have no instance of this acc.

P. 33 l. 31 dimisit unumquemque in propria uoluntate eligere bonum et malum. Aug. serm. 232 2 m. uideamus si dimisit eos errare. Hier. ep. 82 9 f. si boni <sumus>, dimittant quiescere. Rönsch 359 360.

P. 34 l. 2 dilectissimus dei Paulus. cf. 36 36. 37 33. 38 23 36. 41 17. 36 15 Paulum delectissimum meum. 38 26 Iacob dilectissimus meus.

P. 35 l. 9 uiuit dominus. 'as the Lord liveth', an oath common in the books from Judges to 2 Kings[1] and in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

P. 35 l. 18 agonizabo. Pelag. in Aug. de gestis Pelagii 54 f. Rönsch 247 248. Ducange. Mansi concil. VIII 157 f. Chrysol. serm. 119 (Migne LII 526[c]) agonizandum. Aldhelm laud. uirg. 36 (Migne LXXXIX 136[c]). Hilduin. uit. Dionys. 15 (Migne CVI 21[b]) agonizantem.

P. 35 l. 21 contempte. Correct Lewis-Short: 'only in

[1] In chron. it occurs once (II 18 13).

comp. contemptius'. Riddle-White, more modestly: '*Pos.* and *sup.* prob. not in use'.

P. 36 l. 25 propositus hic est qui peccant. Something seems wanting, *e.g.* pr. <exitus> hic est <iis> qui p.

P. 36 l. 27 quod opus fuit nasum in mundo? As *superbia* follows, *nasum* 'scorn', is probably right. It may be acc. as in Plaut. and Cato and Lucr. v 1053. cf. Claud. Mamert. 65 15; or nom. neut. (the only form in Plaut. see Lucil. p. 162 Müller). In classical Latin the pronoun would be *quid*.

P. 36 l. 30 magis peiora. [Quintil.] decl. 5 11 magis artiore. Apul. met. IX 36. Arnob. I 58 Hild. Wetstein on Phil. 1 23. my Latin Heptateuch 53 26. Rufin. h. e. X 8 (II 19 ed. Rome 1740—1). Jani ars poët. 238. Duker's Flor. ind. 'minus'.

P. 37 l. 16 17 arbor . . . que fluet aquas. Georges 'fluo' D cites exx. of this acc. from Claud., Ambr., Aug., Cael. Aurel., Isid. See Muncker on Hygin. fab. 9 (33, 575 Staveren).

P. 37 l. 19 20 ex quo autem praeceptum dei apparuit celum et terram. Mr James in n. ? *ἐφανέρωσεν*. This may be right, or we may read *apparauit*, or (which is most probable) *praecepto . . . terra*.

P. 37 l. 21 arborem hunc. l. 23 arbor per quem. p. 24 l. 29. Lewis-Short cites an inscr. add the ancient version of Dioscorid. I 132 pr. p. 100 a l. 32 (in Romanische Forschungen). Diez, Grammatik der roman. Sprachen II[3] (Bonn 1871) 20: "*Arbor* bleibt im pg. *árvore* feminin, im sp. *árbol*, pr. *albre*, fr. *arbre* ist es masculin, im it. *arbore* commune".

P. 37 l. 28 me autem adhuc intendente lignum. Cassian. coll. I 14 5 si autem et illud . . . uoluerimus intendere. XVII 25 15 praesentis in illo meritum uitae remunerans, non peccatum futurae praeuaricationis intendens. Rönsch 371—2 Vict. Vit. pers. Vand. III 31 (= V 7) quae res hodieque posita in promptu demonstrat. alios sine manibus, alios sine oculis, alios absque pedibus, alios truncos naribus auribusque intendas.

P. 38 l. 13 retro me uenientes obviam tibi. Apul. met. VI 8 conueniat retro metas Murtias Mercurium. Rönsch 399. Archiv f. lat. Lexik. VIII 294. Chalcid. Timae. 239 (274

19 seq. Wr.) idemque angulus . . . longius acutus . . . longius euagatus cuncta quae retro nos sunt in speculo uideri facit.

P. 38 l. 18 33 37 28. 40 27. 41 12 36 a longe. Cassian. coll. II 6 2. Rönsch 231. so cod. β in hist. Apollon. Tyr. 37 pr. (al. de longe, which occurs Veg. mil. III 18 p. 102 26 Lang and Ioseph. ant. I 27 p. 30 p. m., ed. 1524).

P. 38 l. 28 abrenunciacione. Mr James gives this word no place in his index. It is unknown to Ducange, Riddle-White and Lewis-Short; Georges and Benoist-Goelzer confine themselves to a general 'eccl.' With its kindred it will furnish a most interesting article to the compiler of what is greatly needed, a critical lexicon of liturgical Latin. I could fill pages with bare references, so rich is the crop, but content myself with what I find under this one word in my margins. See Archiv f. lat. Lexik. V 123. Aug. c. sec. resp. Iulian. II 224 Cassian. inst. IV (34 tit.) 33 f. 34 pr. 43. VIII 22 f. XII 32 2. coll. III 3 2. 6 (on the three kinds of *abrenuntiatio*) 1 4 ter. 7 1 7 bis 11. 10 4 ter 5. IV 21 4. XXIV 2 1. Bonif. 188 pr. Jaffé. The *verb* occurs thrice in the Visio Pauli. 14 5. 24 33. 33 14. See Ducange, whose editors cite an excellent note by Rittershaus on Saluian (gub. VI 32), p. 208, which first directed my attention to this matter some thirty years ago. Bingham also in his account of baptism cites many authorities Greek (*ἀποτάσσομαι* cet.) and Latin. See Aug. serm. 268 (V app. 441[b]). peccat. merit. I 34 (X 35[d]). Migne LII 701[c]. 874. Archiv f. lat. Lex. V 723—4. acta mart. Scillit. p. 507 Aubé. Luc. 9 61 cod. Bezae. Cass. coll. I 6 tit. II 26 4. III 7 9 10. IV 20 1. V 8 3. 18 2. 22. XVI 6 1. Inst. IV 27 1 pr.

P. 39 l. 5 in nullo = nulla in re. Tert. adu. Marc. V 7. III 12 pr. in nullo conuenire apol. 6 pr. de idol. 11 m. de cor. 10. Cypr. 466 11 in nullo auocentur (cf. l. 8 in nulla re auocarentur). 607 3. 760 20. Hil. trin. I 5 f. [Aug.] ad fratr. erem. serm. 2. Petschenig has 9 exx. in his ind. to Cassian. Saluian. gub. V 30 f. VII 37. eccl. IV 41. Iren. II 26 3. 32 3. 33 1. IV 35 2. Clem. recogn. X 15. Ioseph. ant. (Basil. 1524) II 9 p. 50 a. m. 13 p. 56 ter. III 1 p. 63 a. m. IV 4 pr. p. 96. 5 p. 99 m. 100. m. bis. 6 p. 104 f. On *nullo* =

nulla re see Nipperdey on Tac. an. III 15. Obbar on Hor. ep. I 17 22.

P. 39 l. 22 labores quos pertuli propter filios Israel ad nihilum disputati <sunt>. Possibly *dissupati*, as sheep *dispersed* precedes. The text may mean 'my toils have been cavilled at and made nothing of'; but the phrase is rather unnatural.

P. 40 l. 16 adproprians salutauit me. So also in ind. But we want 'approaching' (*appropians*), not 'appropriating.' See my glossary to Bede. The word appears in Riddle-White, but not in Lewis-Short. Rönsch 181. Luke 19 14 and 29 Ambr. (Ceriani monum. sacra et profana I 1861). serm. antiq. reliq. 245 Mai. Archiv f. lat. Lexik. II 357—8. Lucifer 240 18 Hartel. Rufin. h. e. VIII 3 p. 467.

P. 40 l. 32 non recedit alter ab alio. Tert. ad Scap. 2 alii... alterius. Cassian. coll. IV 20 3 alia...altera. Migne LII 742c alter caeditur et alius confitetur.

P. 41 l. 1 ex ichore plagae. The ms. has: ego autem sum Iob qui multum laboraui ·XXX· annorum tempus exi cuo; plaga. It is possible that an epithet to *plaga* is to be sought; *ichore* certainly will not stand; *ictu* or *ulcere* would be better, though not the right word.

P. 41 l. 16 salutauimus uos alterutrum. Correct the misprint by reading *nos*.

P. 41 l. 19 centum annos feci. 28 32 dies aliquos facientes in orationibus. Gronov. on Sen. ep. 66 § 4, p. 231. Commod. apol. 566. Clem. recogn. III 67 pr. CIL V 6261. VIII 3160. 9638. IX 659. Rönsch 366.

P. 41 l. 21 continentiam studui. inscr. in the museum at Lyon, Edm. Le Blant, inscr. chrét. de la Gaule I (Par. 1856, 4to) 41 (epitaph of the trader Agapus): fuit iste stacio miseris et portus eginis...loca sanctorum adsedue et elemosinam et oracionem studuit. The acc. is cited also from Plaut. mil. 1437 *has res*. Titinius psaltria in Prisc. p. 629 P. (ver. 85 Ribb.) *Ferentinatis populus res graecas studet*.

P. 41 l. 23 neque insordidate sunt uestes meae. A word added to lexx. in 1893 by Benoist-Goelzer. I had many years

ago cited the same passage (expos. totius mundi in Riese's geogr. lat. min. 105 23).

P. 41 l. 26 subsanabantur uerba mea. Georges has anticipated some of my exx. but not Hier. ep. 66 6. adu. Iouin. I 34. adu. Vigilant. 13. in Osee II (7 14 seq. VI 79^{c}, Ven. 1768). Hil. in ps. 41 11. Aug. in ps. 79 11. serm. 111 c. 1 m. 280 c. 2 pr. de anima I 18 f. Aldhelm de laud. uirgin. 51 (Migne LXXXIX 151^{a}). Rönsch 199.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

BENTLEY'S NOTES ON THE ODYSSEY.

(*Continued from p.* 42.)

ε.

THE first 42 lines, being the "second council" of the gods are much marked in the margin. After 43 a line is drawn across the page and "'Ερμείας δ'" is substituted for *αὐτίκ' ἔπειθ'*. Bentley then considered the second council to be an addition to the poem, supposing it to have involved this slight change in 44.

1, 2. "Il. λ, 1, 2."

3. *θῶκόνδε καθίζανον* underlined.

4. *ὑψιβρεμέτης*. The last six letters underlined.

5. *λέγε* underlined.

6. *δώμασι* underlined.

8—13. "*β*, 230."

8. *ἀγανὸς καί*. "*τε*" inserted before *καί*.

10. *αἴσυλα*. "*ἀή*" *συλα*.

14—17. "δ. 557."

18—20. "δ, 700, 1, 2."

26. "*ε*, 144."

30, 31. "*α* 86, 87."

34. *κ' εἰκοστῷ*. "*ϝει*"

35—37. "*τ*, 279, 280."

38—40. "*ν*, 136, 7, 8."

41, 42. "*ε*, 114, 115"—*τ' ἰδέειν*. "*ϝι*"

44. "vide δ 625 et *ο* 1. et 300. *φ* 360." These passages are all instances of change of scene where a person is mentioned to mark the transition. Thus they defend his suggested

'Ερμείας δ', for *αὐτίκ' ἔπειθ'*. The deciphering and explanation of this note are due to Mr Aldis Wright and Dr Jackson. Also "*a* 97, 8, 9."

53. *πυκινά.* "*πυκνὰ*"—"Hes. *πυκνὰ πτερά.*"

54. Bracketed. "*τινὲς ἀθετοῦσιν* teste Eustathio. nec solet *ἑρμῆς* sed *ἑρμείας.*" For *πολέεσσιν* "*πολιοῖσιν.*"

63. *ἀμφιπεφύκει* (sic Steph.) "*ἀμφι πε*"

66. "Athen. IX, Alexander Myndius apud Hom. *χωρὶς τοῦ σ κῶπες*, et sic Aristotelem, Speusippum, Epicharmum, Metrodorum."

67. "Hes. *τῇσί τε θ. ε. μ.*" (*θαλάσσια ἔργα μέμηλεν*).

72. "*ῥίου*"—"Athen. ii, 19. Ptolemaeus Euergetes, legebat *σίου*, non *ἴου*. Probante Eustathio. Ptolemaeus rex erat Aristarchi discipulus, Athen. ii in fine."

76. "*γ'*" between *πάντα* and *ἐῷ.*

81. *ἔνδον.* "*ῥοίκοι*"

83. "alij *ὀρεχθῶν*, ut *ὀρέχθεον*, sed melius *διὰ τὸ ε̄. σχολ.* Apollonij ad 1, 275."

84. "H 234 *δερδέσκετο.* vide 158." Does H 234 mean H & L 2, 3, 4?

87. *'Ερμεία χρυσόῤῥαπι.* "*ας πις* Il. 16. 385" and "Hes. *χρυσόῤῥαπις.*" i.e. read *'Ερμείας χρυσόῤῥαπις.* Il. 16. 385 must be quoted as parallel to what he thinks a corrupt vocative: he means then Il. 18. 385, *τίπτε, Θέτι ταυύπεπλε.*

90. *εἰ δύναμαι τελέσαι γε καὶ εἰ τετελεσμένον ἐστίν.*
"*τὸ δὲ καὶ*
"*καὶ μὲν* } *ἔσται.*"

96. *μιν ἔπεσσιν.* "*ῥε ῥεπ*"

97, 98. Bracketed. "Eust. *φασι οἱ παλαιοί, ὅτι εὐτελεῖς οἱ δύο στίχοι καὶ κατὰ συνθήκην καὶ κατὰ διάνοιαν. ἐνισπήσω* nusquam alibi."

99. "Dio Chrys. Orat. 32 *ἐμέγ'*." There exist variants. Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

100. *δ' ἂν ἑκών.* "*δὲ ϝεκὼν*" and *δὲ* then altered to "*κε.*"

108—111. Bracketed.

110. "Hesyc. *ἀπέφθιτον.*"

114. *τ' ἰδέειν.* "*ϝι*"

117. *φωνήσασ' ἔπεα.* "*σασα ϝέπεα*"

118. *ζηλήμονες.* "Il. ω. 33"—"Eust. *γράφεται καὶ δηλήμονες.* Nota, nusquam Homerus *ζῆλος* sed saepius *δηλήμων* sed habet *δύσζηλοι.*"

119. "Etym. M. in *Ἀτρείδῃσι.*"

122. "*ἄρα ϝοι ἀγα*" i.e. read *τόφρ' ἄρα ϝοι ἀγάασθε.*

125. *Ἰασίωνι ἐϋπλόκαμος.* "*ν' ἠϋ*"

135. *ἠδὲ ἔφασκον.* "*ϝε φάσ*" (*ἠδέ ϝε φάσκον*).

153. *ἤνδανε.* "*ϝη*" corrected to "*ϝα*"

157. Bracketed, being absent from HL.

158. "*Δερδέσκετο* H, 2, 3, 4." Cf. 84.—*δάκρυα λείβων.* "*ρυον εἴ*", crossed out again.

177. *ἐγὼν ἀέκητι.* "*ἔγωγε ϝέ*"-*κητι.* "L *ἔγωγε ἀέκητι*" meaning CL; see my introductory observations.

182. *ἄλιτρός γ'.* "leg. *ἄϝιδρίς γ'*"

206. *εἴ γε μὲν εἰδείης.* "*εἰ δέ γε ϝει*"

207. *ἀναπλῆσαι.* "an ubique *ἀνατλῆσαι.* Hesyc. non habet *ἀναπλῆσαι.* vide Od. *π*, 205." MSS of *π* 205 vary between *ἀληθείς* and *ἀνατλάς.*

209. *ἰδέσθαι.* "*ἰκ*"

220. *ἰδέσθαι.* "*ἰκέ*"

230. "Etym. M. in *Αργ. Αμφὶ δὲ ἀργ.*" i.e. Etym. Mag. reads *ἀμφὶ δὲ ἀργύφεον* for *αὐτὴ δ' ἀργύφεον.*

234. *δῶκε μέν οἱ.* "*δέ ϝοι*"

255. *ποιήσατο, ὄφρ'.* "*τ' ἄρ*" (*ποιήσατ' ἂρ ὄφρ'*) but this is then erased. Then "*Λγ'*" (*ποιήσατό γ' ὄφρ'*) and "*θ' ὅδ'* 254" (*ποιήσαθ' ὅδ' ὄφρ'*). Why 254?

256. "Hes. *Οἰσυίνῃσι* et *Οἰσυΐνοισι.*"

257. *ἐπεχεύατο ὕλην.* "*ατ' ἂρ ὕ*" (*ἐπεχεύατ' ἂρ ὕλην*).

261. *τήν γε κατείρυσεν.* "*τὴν καταϝείρυσαν.*"

262. *ἅπαντα.* "*ϝέκαστα.*"

266. *τὸν ἕτερον ἕτερον δ'.* "*ϝέ ϝέ*" quibus deletis "*γ'*" post *τόν.*

ἐν δὲ καὶ ἤϊα. "*δ' ἤϊα* 264." 264 seems quoted for spondaic ending.

273. "Hesyc. *Ἀρκτοῦρον*, male."

281. *ὡς ὅτε ῥινόν.* In margin "*-νὸς*" (*ῥινὸς*), at top of page "Hes. *ἐρινόν, νέφος.* legebat *ὅτ' ἐρινόν.* vide Didymum." At bottom "Eust. Aristarch. *ἔρινον.*"

287. *ὀδυσῆι.* "*σῆος. θ*, 267" quoted for *ἀμφὶ* with genitive.

290. *φημι ἄδην.* "*ϝά*" which being erased "*γ*'" is supplied after *φημι.*

296. "fo. *Βορέης αἰθρηγενέτα μέγα*, ut *νεφεληγερέτα*, non *της.*"

298. "lego, *ὀχθήσας δ' ϝεῖπε προτὶ ϝὸν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.* vide 285"; but in margin "*ἄρ' ἔϝειπεν ἑόν,*" and "*ἔφη προτί.*"

299. "Eust. *γράφεται καὶ μήχιστα*, i.e. *τὶ γένοιτο μῆχος.*"

302. "Eust. *γράφεται καὶ Ἀνατλήσειν.*"

312. *εἵμαρτο ἀλῶναι.* "*ϝει ϝα*"

333. "Eust. Text. Not. *τὸν δϝεῖδεν*" (i.e. Eust. has *τὸν δ' εἶδεν* for *τὸν δὲ ἴδεν*). In margin "*σχολ.* Pind. Ol. 2." (*δ' εἶδεν* Schol. Pind. Ol. II. 51. La Roche.)

334. "Eust. *Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Χαμαιλέων οὐδήεσσα* i.e. *ἐπίγειος,*" for *αὐδήεσσα.*

335. *ἐξέμμορε.* "*ἓξ ἔμ*"

337. "Eust. *γράφεται ποτή, ποτῇ, ποτήν.* vide Hesych."

355. *δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὅν.* "*δϝεῖπε προτὶ ϝεῖπεν ἑὸν* 376"

356. *μή τίς μοι ὑφαίνῃσιν δόλον ἄλλον* Stephanus in text, with *αὖτε* as variant in margin. "*ἄλλος*" Bentley, apparently a conjecture, though it has also MS authority.

362. *πάσχων.* "fo. *πέσσων.*"

365. *ἕως ὁ.* "*ὅ γε* 386"

371. *ἀμφ' ἑνὶ δούρατι.* "non *ἐπὶ δούρατι*, sed natabat."
κέληθ' ὡς. "*ης ϝὼς*"

378. "Dio Chrys. Orat. 64 *κ' ἀλῷο κατὰ π. Εἰσ. ἀνθρώποισι.*" Quoted for *ἀνθρώποισι* against *Φαιήκεσσι.* Not in La Roche or Ludwich. "*φαιήκεσσι*" in marg.

379. *ἔολπα ὀνόσσεσθαι.* After *ἔολπα* he inserts "*γ*'."

385. "*κύματα ἄξεν* Plut. p. XXIII."

392. "*ἔσριδε.*"

400. "Hes. "*Οσσον τε γ. β.*"

404. "Hesyc. *Ἐπιωγαί, οἱ ἀνειμένοι τοποι.* leg. *ἀνήνεμοι.*"

407. *ἄρα* deleto "*ϝεῖπεν ποτὶ ϝὸν*"

415. *λίθακι ποτὶ.* "*προτὶ*"

424. *ἕως ὁ.* "*ὅ γε* 386"

433. "Hesyc. *κοτυληδών, ὄφις*, male."

453. ἔκαμψε. "νε Il. π, 106." (ἔκαμνε).

464. "an ἄρ' ἔφη πρὸς ἑὸν" and "ϝεῖπεν ἑὸν"

473. θήρεσσιν ἔλωρ. "σι ϝε"

475. "an βήμεναι εἰς ὕλην" for βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν εἰς.

478. "Plut. p. XII et Hes. διάησι, διάη Temp. Imperfecti."—"διάη. τ. 440."

479. οὐδέποτ'. "οὔτεπ ζ, 43."

484. "fo. ἢ τρεῖς ἄνδρας γε ϝερ." for ἠὲ τρεῖς ἄνδρας ἔρυσθαι.

486. μὲν ἰδών. "δὲ ϝιδὼν."

487. φύλλων. "πολλήν."

493. "Plut. p. 38 δυσπραγέος καμάτοιο."

ζ.

8. εἶσεν δ' ἐν Σχερίῃ. "ε δ' ἐνὶ"

35. "leg. σοι v. 60" for τοι. "σοι 39"

60. "fo. καὶ δὲ ϝέοικε σοὶ αὐτῷ ἐνὶ πρώτοισιν ἐόντι," quibus deletis "καὶ δὴ σοί τε ϝέοικε," "Σοὶ αὐτῷ δὲ ϝεο."

76. "Aristoph. σχολ. Acharn. p. 299 Μήτηρ δ' ἐν κίστει ἐτίθει μενοεικέα δαῖτα· ὄψα τε οἷα ἔδουσι διοτρεφέες βασιλῆες: κίστει, κίστιν, κίστεως."

77. δ' οἶνον. "δροι"

83. αἱ δ' ἄμοτον. "οἱ 89." δ' ἐσθῆτα. "δρε" The mules are masculine in 89 for Stephanus reads τοὺς there.

89. τοὺς. "τὰς H omnes."

95. "ἀποπτύεσκε H omnes." ἀποπλύνεσκε Steph.

111. ζεύξασ'...πτύξασα. "ξουσ' ξουσα 252."

115. σφαῖραν ἔπειτα. "Eust. Διονυσόδωρος γράφει Πάλλαν ἔπ. ταὐτὸν ὂν τῇ σφαίρᾳ. vide Hesyc."

121. "θεουδής, forte θεωδής, ut θηριωδής. sed Ἀντιφῶν, Ἄνθρωπος πάντων θηρίων θεαιδέστατος; apud Etym. et Suidam in θεαιδ. Et Eustath. Il. p. 286. Credo Antiphonem scripsisse θεωδέστατος."

122. "forte Ἤ νύ με κ." for ὥς τέ με.

131. "leg. ἐν δέ ϝοί ἦτορ δαίεται ut Od. α 48." ἦτορ for ὅσσε.

141. "Hes. Στῆ ῥ' ἀντασχομένη et Σχομένη."

151. *σε ἐγώ γε.* "leg. *σ' ἂν ἐγ.*" in margin "*σ' ἄρ'*"

157. "λευσσόντων vide Od. *ι* 256." Quoted for a genitive following a dative, as here.

160. *τοιοῦτον ἴδον.* "*τοιόνδε ϝίδον*" and under this "175" which seems to be a false reference.

162, 3. "Sic Dion. *τέχνη* p. 523."

179. *που εἴλυμα.* "*το* (?) *ϝει*"

183. *οἶκον ἔχητον.* "Hierocles *οἴκι' ἔχ.*"

193. *ὧν ἐπέοιχ'.* "*ὧν τε ϝέοιχ'*"
ἀντιάσαντα. "*σασθαι*"

200. *μή.* "*μιν*"

201. *οὗτος.* "*οὔτις*"

216. *ἤνωγον.* "fo. *ἤπειγον* | *Ὠτρυνον η.* 34" another false reference.

226. "Hes. *Ἀλὸς χνόον.*"

230. *εἰσιδέειν.* "*εσϝι*"

239. *μοι* (Steph.). "*μευ*"

262. *πόλιος ἐπιβήσομεν.* "*πόλεως ἐπιβείομεν*"; under the latter word "LLLH."

269. *ἀποξύνουσιν.* "*ξύουσ*"

275. *ὥδ' εἴπῃσι.* "*ὡς ϝείπῃσι*"

280. *ἤ τίς οἱ.* "*Ἦ τί ϝοι*"

296. *ἄστυ δὲ ἔλθωμεν.* "*ϝάστυ* διέλ 304" and "*η*, 40"

303. *ἥρωος.* "L *ἥρω.* Eust. Od. *θ* 323 *Ἀλκινόοιο Ἥρως τινὲς οὐ κλητικῇ ἀλλὰ γενικῇ ἀπὸ Ἥρωος.*"

311. *ἴδηαι.* "*ἵκηαι γ.* 233."

313, 314. Bracketed. "313, 14, 15 H desunt et LL 312 etc. venit post 315."

314. *τ' ἰδέειν.* "*ϝιδ*"

318. "L *εὖ δ' ἐπλήσσοντο* Aristoph. *σχολ.* Acharn. p. 27 *εὖ δ' ἐπλίσσοντο* ad *ἀπεπλίξατο.*"

η.

6. *ἔλυον ἐσθῆτά τε ἔσφερον.* "*τ' ἄρ'*" and "Barnes dedit *ἐλύοντ' ἐσθ.*"

11. *δ' ὥς.* "*δϝὼς*"

17. *τ' ἐπέεσσι.* "*ϝε*"

64. "Hesyc. Ἄκουρον. ἔτ' pro βάλ'." i.e. Hes. reads ἔτ' for βάλ' s.v. ἄκουρον[1].

76. Delet τ' before ἰδέειν.

89. ἀργύρεοι δὲ σταθμοί is changed to ἀργύρεοι σταθμοὶ δ'. "Barnes dedit Σταθμοὶ δ' ἀργύρεοι."

93. φυλασσέμεναι. "Hesyc. φυλάσσειν."

100. "Etym. M. in 'Αμβωμοισι. εὐδμήτῳ ἐπὶ βωμῷ."

101. "Max. Tyr. Diss. 3. χερσὶ φέροντες." Not in La Roche or Ludwich.

104. "Hesyc. Μήλοπα καρπόν."

106. "Hesyc. Ἥμεναι οἷα etc."

107. "Etym. M. καιροσσέων. Et καιροσέων." "καιροσσέων, Hesych. Eustath. vide Hesyc."

118. "ἐπετήσιος, hic tantum." In margin "διϝε"-τήσιος.

119. Ζεφυρίη. "Ζεπφυρίη, ut ὄφις, ὄπφις; σκύφος, σκύπφος." In margin "πφ"

126. "Hes. ὑποπερκάζουσι."

134. "γ'" after πάντα.

154. πὰρ πυρί· οἱ. "τοὶ"

187. ὄφρ' εἴπω. "an ὄφρα ϝέπω." In margin "αὐδῶ."

191. καλὰ ἔπειτα. "κᾶλ' ἐσεπ"

196. πρίν γε τὸν ἦς. "ἑῆς" deleto γε.

197. "Eust. γρ. κατακλωθησι βαρεῖα. οὐ καλῶς. In hac ἐκδόσει versus sequens deerat. κατακλῶθες nusquam alibi, nec Νήσαντο. Αἶσα et μοῖρα ἐπένησε λίνῳ."

198. "Il. υ, 128. ω, 210."

211. "Hesyc. ὀχέοντας ὀϊζύν."

213. Bracketed. "H in marg. L deest."

217. ἐκέλευσεν ἕο. "σε ϝεο" crossed out again.

218. "Athen. lib. x. τειρόμενον, καὶ ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἀνωγει. sed et 221."

222. ὀτρύνεσθε. "leg. ὀτρύνεσθαι." "σθαι κ, 425." "H γρ. ὀτρύνεσθαι." The reading of κ 425 however is also ὀτρύνεσθε.

230. ὁ ἐν. "ὅ γ'"

[1] The ἔτ' of Hesychius leaves no verb in the sentence, but it does not look like a simple misreading of βάλ'. Qu. was there a reading τὸν μὲν ἄκουρον ἔτ' ὄντα βάλ'?

232. *ἀπεκόσμεον.* "σχολ. Pind. olym. 13—*ἐπεκόσμεον* | Hesych. ut editum."

234. "ζ, 214" and "*ἔχοντα*" for *ἰδοῦσα.*

236. *φωνήσασ' ἔπεα.* "*σασα ϝεπ*"

244. "Hesyc. 'Ωγυγίη, et 'Ογυγία, *μέλη* pro 'Ωγυγίη, *μεγάλη.*"

256. *ἠδὲ ἔφασκε.* "δ' *ἔμε φάσκε.*"

259. *ἔμπεδον εἵματα.* "*ἔμπεδα ϝει*" "θ, 275. λ, 151" (λ 152: in both *ἔμπεδον*). "*ἔμπεδον ἔμπεδα*, ut *ἀναφανδὸν ἀναφανδά, ἄμφαδον ἄμφαδα.*"

261. *δὴ ὄγδοον.* "*δὴ ὀγδόατον.*"

267. *ἑπτακαίδεκα* (sic Steph.) "*ἑπτὰ δὲ καὶ δέκα*" from MSS. "Od. ε. 178." (ε 278.)

273. *οὐδέ τι.* "*οὐδ' ἔτι.*"

280. *ἕως ἐπῆλθον.* "*ποτ'*" after *ἕως.*

289. *δύσετο.* "*Δείλετο* ζ, 321."—"Eust. *δύσετο*, 'Αρίσταρχος *Δείλετο.*"

326. *ἀπήνυσαν οἴκαδ'.* "fo. *ἀνῆγον ϝοίκαδ'.*" In margin "*ἀπῆγον ϝοι* 324."

341. *ὄτρυνον δ'.* "*-υνοντ'* θ, 31."

θ.

15. *καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου.* "*θυμόν τε ϝε*"

22, 23. Bracketed. "Η *ἀθετεῖ Ζηνόδοτος. οὐ γὰρ πολλοὺς ἐτέλεσεν ἐν φαιακίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐδίσκευσεν μόνον.*"

27. *εἶπω.* "*αὐδῶ.*"

28. *οὐκ οἶδ'.* "*οὐ ϝοῖδ'*"

34. "fo. 'Αλλὰ *μέλαιναν νῆα ϝε*" *-ρύσσομεν.* "52"

37. "*εὖ πάντες*: ergo male supra *σύμπαντα* pro *εὖ πάντα.* Quaere locum." δ 494? but there is no note there.

45. "*τέρπειν*" for *τερπνήν.* "Eust. Not. *τερπνὴν ὅπη οἱ θυμός. τερπνὴν γρ. καὶ τέρπειν.*"—"Od. α, 247." (α 347.)

55. *ἐν νοτίῳ.* "Η *ἐννοδίῳ*, 'Αριστοφ. sic Hesych."

57. "Hesych. *Αιδωσσα, τῆς Αὐλῆς τὰ τείχεα.* pro *Αἴθουσαι.*"

58. Bracketed from MSS.

64. *μέν.* "*μιν.*"

74. "forte Οἴμη, ut Ἡλεκτρύων etc." He means Ἡετίων; see Z 396; the point to be illustrated is the nominative resuming an oblique case.

76. "Hesych. Δαΐς—Ἦλθεν δὲ δαΐς θάλεια πρεσβίστη θεῶν. vulgo θήλεια."

79—82. Bracketed. "H. ἐν ἐνίαις ταῖς ἐκδόσεσιν οὐκ ἐφέροντο· διὸ ἀθετοῦνται."

91. τέρποντ' ἐπέεσσιν. "το ϝεπ"

98. δαιτὸς κεκορήμεθα θυμὸν ἐΐσης. "H οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος. οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι, θυμὸν κ. δαιτὸς ἐΐσης. (nota θα θυ.)"

99. "Od. ρ, 271." "Athen. XIV φόρμιγγός θ' ἣν δαιτὶ θεοὶ ποίησαν ἑταίρην." Athen. XIV 627 (La Roche ad ρ 271).

108. "Hesyc. θαυμανέοντες. corr."

124. οὖρον. "ϝοῦ" crossed out again.

125. λαούς. "fo. ἄλλους."

126. "Eust. Ἀρίσταρχος hic ut in Iliade παλαιμοσύνης."

129. προφερέστατος (Steph.) "H πανυπέρτατος," which Bentley at first wrote in the margin, then deleted this and substituted "πολὺ φέρτατος." "Eust. Not. HL πολὺ φέρτατος. πανυπερτάτη ι, 25 est extrema, ultima."

133. ἐρώμεθα εἴ τιν'. "εσθ'" (ἐρώμεσθ').

136. οὐδέ τι ἤβης. "ϝή," quo deleto "τοι" for τι.

141. Bracketed. "H οὔτε Ἀρίσταρχ. Ἀριστοφ. Ζηνόδ. οἴδασι τοῦτον τὸν στίχον."

143. παΐς. "πάϊς."

146. Bracketed. "lego Εἴ τινά που δέδαάς σε: ϝέοικε {δὲ / σε} ϝίδμεν ἀέθλους." δέδαάς σε then deleted and γε written over σε, which appears to have been a slip of the pen; the subsequent erasure of δέδαας must be also accidental.

151. τε κατείρυσται. "κατα ϝεί"

163. "Aristoph. σχολ. Nub. p. 995 ἐπίσκοπος. Hesych. utrumque." ἐπίσκοπος Steph. v. l. ἐπίστροφος. Schol. Nubes 623 (La Roche).

164. "Hesyc. Ἀλπαλαιῶν, ἀγαπητὸν pro Ἀρπαλέων, ἁρπακτικῶν. vide Ἁρπαλέως." (ἁρπαλέως ἁρπακτικῶς Hes.)

169. τ' εἶδος. "ϝεῖ" "Lucian. ἔρωτες—εἶδός τις ἀκ"-ιδνότερος.

170. *μορφὴν ἔπεσι.* "fo. *μορφῆ ϝεπέων* λ, 366 Athenaeus XV, p. 674 *Ἀλλὰ θεὸς μορφὴν ἔπεσι στέφει.*" λ 367. The quotation by Athenaeus is not given by La Roche or Ludwich.

211. "*ϝέο*" crossed out again.

215. "*ἠϋ*" (*ϝοῖδ' ἠΰξοον* for *οἶδα ἐΰξοον*).

216. "leg. *Πρῶτος δ' ἄνδρα βάλοιμ' ἀν.* Eustath. legit *Πρῶτος ἂν ἄνδρα.*" To avoid hiatus after *βάλοιμι*: in margin he secures this by inserting "*γ'*."

240. "Il. ξ, 92." "Vid. *ἐπισταίη.*"

251. *παίσατε· ὥς.* "*τ' ὅπως*" (*παίσαθ' ὅπως*).

259. *ἕκαστα.* "*ἅπαντα.*"

260. "Hes. *Λείηναν.*"

263. *ἵσταντο.* "*μι*" deletum.

267. "Etym. M. in *Αφροδ.—ἄρεω.* vide et in *Ἄρεω* ab *Ἄρεως.*" (Etym. M. 179 and 138.)

274. "Hes. *κόπτε δὲ δεσμούς.*"

280. *τά κ'.* "*τά γ'*" deletum.

283. *εἶσατ'.* "*ϝει*"
ἐς Λῆμνον. "*πρὸς* 287, 294, 303."

296. "Hesyc. *Κατέταρπον*, male."

299. "*φυκτὰ* Barnes male *φευκτὰ* et *πεφευγμένος.* Sic a *τεύχω, τυκτός*, et *τετυγμένος.*"

307. He prefers "*ϝέργ' ἀγέλαστα*" to *ἔργα γέλαστα*; "Eust. *γρ. ἔργ' ἀγέλαστα.*"

315. *σφᾶς ἔτ' ἔολπα.* "*σφωε ϝεο*"

318. *ἀποδῶσιν ἔεδνα.* "*δῶσι ϝε*"

324. *ἑκάστη.* "*ἁπᾶσαι.*"

326. *γέλως.* "*γέλος.*"

332. "Athenaeus XII p. 511 *τέχνῃ. τῷ καὶ ζωάγρι'.* Vide Il. *ψ*. 547. Vide hic Casaub." In Ψ 547 is the same variation between *τῶ* and *τό.*

343. *γέλως.* "*ος*"

344. *γέλως.* "*ος*"

352. *ἐγώ σε δέοιμι.* "*σ' εὐθύνοιμι.*" "H *ἀριστάρχ. Πῶς ἄν σ' εὐθύνοιμι.*" This however is the explanation, not the reading, of Aristarchus.

382. "Etym. M. in *Αριδ. ἀριδείκετε ἀνδρῶν.*"

392. *οἱ ἕκαστος.* "*ῥα ϝεκ*"

394. "LH ἀολλέα." "γρ. ἀολλέα. Barnes. Recte ut Od. ξ 432 ἀολλέα vel ibi legendum ἀολλέες."

396. αὐτόν. "τὸς"

408. "Plutarch. de Dogm. Plat. εἴ πέρ τι λέλεκται" for βέβακται. Plut. Qu. Plat. 1010 (Ludwich).

410. ἄλοχόν τ' ἰδέειν. "τε ϝιδεῖν"—"χον ϝιδέειν."

429. "Nusquam alibi ὕμνος. forte οἶμον, ὁδόν, unde οἴμη, ᾠδή. Οἶμος, οἴμη idem; ut αἶνος, αἴνη, πόθος, ποθή, χόλος, χολή, βίοτος, βιοτή, ὠνὴ ὦνος, τιμὴ τῖμος."—"vel ἀοιδιόωντος" but this is deleted. "ἀοιδοῦ οἶμον."

442. φωνήσασ' ἔπεα. "σασα ϝεπ"

450. ἀσπασίως. "σιος"

452. ἐπειδὴ. "ἐππ"

459. 'Οδυσῆα ἐν. "σῆ' εἰν."

460. φωνήσασ' ἔπεα. "σασα ϝε"

466. ἰδέσθαι. "leg. ἰκέσθαι γ. 233." In margin "ἰκέσθαι ὁρᾶσθαι"

468. "Hesyc. Βιόσσαο et 'Εβιώσαο."

483. ἥρωϊ (sic Steph.) "ρῳ"

488. παῖς. "πάϊς"

489. ἀχαιῶν underlined.

490. ἀχαιοί underlined.

506. σφισιν ἤνδανε. "σι ϝην" corrected in different ink to "ϝάν"

524. ὅς τε ἐῆς. "ποτ'" for τε.

525. "Η Καλλίστρατος καὶ ὤρεσσι. ὡς τὸ ἀμυνέμεναι ὤρεσσι."

526. ἀσπαίροντ' ἐσιδοῦσα. "τα ϝι"

547. ἀνέρι ὅς. "γ'" inserted.

560. πόλιας. "λεας"

571. εἴη. "ἐάῃ"—"Didym. εἰῇ ἀντὶ ἐάσειε."

578. 'Αργείων, δαναῶν (so Steph. with comma). "τ'" inserted after δαναῶν.

ἠδ' 'Ιλίου. "ἰδὲ Ϝι"

580. ἵνα ᾖσι. "ἵν' ἔῃσι."

ι.

6. "Eratosthenes sic legit, *ἔχῃ κακότητος ἀπούσης*. Athen. I, 14 sed II, 4 citat *κατὰ δῆμον ἅπαντα*. et item lib. 5. et 12." Athenaeus I 16, II 40, V 192, XII 513. (Ludwich.)

27. *οὔτι*. "*τοι*"

28. *ἧς*. "*τῆς* i.e. *ταύτης*."

30. Bracketed. "H in marg. LL deest."

34. *ἧς*. "*ϝῆς*"—"Hesyc. habet in *Ἧς*."

42. *κίοι αἴσης*. "*κίε ϝίσης κίοι αἴσης* Od. *ν*. 138"

52. *ἠέριοι*. "Ϝειαρινῇ" from H.

56. *ἀέξετο*. "*εται*"

60. *δ' ἀφ' ἑκάστης*. "*δὲ ϝεκ*"

65. "Hesy. *Τρεῖς ἕκαστον ἀΰσας*." For *ἕκαστον* "*ἅπαντας*."

72. *κάτθεμεν* (sic Steph.) "Hesych. *κάθεμεν* ut *κάθεσαν ἱστία*, Hym. in Ap. 503."

73. "Eust. *Ἀρίσταρχος, προερέσσαμεν*. vide N, 79. *ο*, 496. Il. *α*. 435." (*ν* 279, *ο* 497.)

77. *λεύκ' ἐρύσαντες*. "*μ*, 402"

88. *προΐην*. "*ιειν κ*, 100"—"LL *προίειν*."

93. "Hesyc. *Λωτὸς*"

108. "Hesyc. male, *Ἀρόωσις*"

115. "Strabo 592 *ἠδ' ἀλόχου* et Aristot. Eth. x, 9 sed Arist. Polit. I, 1 et Plat. Leg. 3, *ἀλόχων*."

116. *λάχεια*. "*ἐλάχεια*."

122. "fo. *οὐδ' ἄρα τοι ποίμνῃσι κατίσχεται*."

127. *τελέοιεν ἕκαστα*. "*ἑωσι ϝέ*" or "*ἅπαντα*."

133. "fo. *ἄσπετοι*" for *ἄφθιτοι*. But he has written apparently 153 by mistake for 133, nor is *ἄσπετοι* quite certain.

134. "Hesych. in *Αἰεί, Μάλα κεν*"

138. *ναυτέων*. "alibi *ναυτάων*, et sic semper a verbo—*της. βυκτάων αἰχμητάων ὑβριστάων, ἱκετάων*." In margin he has "*-κεν αὖτε*" for *εἰσόκε ναυτέων* from MSS.

139. "Hes. *Λῆται, ἄνεμοι*." To be corrected to *Ἀῆται*.

140. "Hesyc. *κράτος λιμένος*. leg. *κρατὸς*"

143. "*προύφαινε ϝιδέ* 145"

148. *εἰσίδομεν*. "*εσϝι*"

159. ἐς δὲ ἑκάστην. "τῶν δὲ ϝεκάστῃ."

160. "δέκ' forte δύ'" and "550 δύ'," i.e. δύ' corresponds better with 550 where *one* ram is given to Odysseus.

166. "fo. ἐκέλσαμεν vid. Hesych." Deleted. ἐκέλσαμεν, ὡρμίσαμεν Hesych.

182. "σπέος εἴδομεν. fo. εὕρομεν 217"

199. "Eust. ἀρίσταρχος παιδί. σχολ. παιδὶ Ἀρίσταρχ. καὶ Ἀριστοφ." (παισὶ Steph. in margin γρ. παιδί.)

200. ᾤκει. "ϝοίκει."

209. ὕδατος ἀνὰ εἴκοσι. After ὕδατος "δ'" "ἀνὰ ϝει" and afterwards "ἀν' ἐεί"

210. "Plut. p. XVII. fo. ἡδίστη vel -στον. Athen. lib. XI ut ed. an ὀδμὴ ϝηδεῖα δ' ἀπὸ" In margin "ἄρ'" after ἡδεῖα. Plutarch 117, 45 = II 57 (La Roche). Athen. XI 465.

212. δὲ καὶ ἤϊα. (sic Steph.) "δ' ἤια."

215. "ἀρ" after εἰδότα.

221. "Hes. Πρόγονοι et Ἔρσαι"

222. "σχολ. Apollon. I" (I, 1143).

224. λίσσοντ' ἐπέεσσι. "το ϝέ"

231. "ξ 28" referred to for ἐθύσαμεν (Steph. text.) against ἐμείναμεν (Steph. marg.) "Recte ἐθύσαμεν (ut Eust. Text Not.) unde καὶ αὐτοὶ praeter θυσίαν."

233. ἕως ἐπῆλθε. "εἵως ἦλθε ἕως ὅδ'" (ἕως ὅδ' ἐπῆλθε).

240. "313, 314, 340 ἐτίθει"

241. εἴκοσ'. "ϝεί"—"ἐεί"

242. τετράκυκλοι. "τεσσαρα"

245. "Etym. M. ὑπέμβρυον."

246. "Hesyc. Λευκοῖο γάλ."

251. εἴσιδεν. "ἔσϝι"

258. μιν ἔπεσσιν. "ϝε ϝεπ"

269. ἱκέται. "ϝι"

272. "θυμῷ. forte μυθῷ. Od. μ. 278" postea deletum.

274. ἀλέασθαι. "αἰδεῖσθαι," quo deleto "ἰλάεσθαι."

279. ἀλλά μοι εἴφ'. "ἄγε ϝεῖφ'"

282. δολίοις ἐπέεσσι. "οισι ϝεπ"

311. δ' ὅ γε δ' αὖτε. δ' δ' underlined; "344"

320. ἔκταμεν. "ἔκσπασεν"—"Eust. οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι γρ. ἔκσπασε."

321. *ἄμμες εἰσκομεν.* "*με ϝεί*," quo deleto "*ϝείσ*" (sic).

339. *ἤ τι.* "*ἤ τοι*"

340. *ἐπέθηκε.* "*ἐτίθει*"

344. *δ' ὅ γε δ' αὖτε.* *δ' δ'* underlined; "311"

348. *ὄφρ' εἰδῇς.* "*ρα ϝιδ*"

360. *ὡς ἔφατ'· αὐτάρ οἱ αὖτις ἐγὼ πόρον.* In margin "*φάτ' ἀτάρ*," at top of page "Leg. *αὐτάρ ϝοι αὖτις πόρον.*" *ἐγὼ* has three dots under it and is marked for deletion.

363. *μιν ἔπεσσι.* "*ϝεπέεσσι*"—"*ϝε ϝεπ*"

372. "Hes. *Ἀποδοχμώσας, πλατύς*, pro *πλάγιος*."

379. *ἄψασθαι.* "leg. *ἄψεσθαι*" for which MSS are quoted at foot of page. "Hesyc. *Ἄψασθαι, ἀναφθήσεσθαι*—*Ἄψεσθαι χλωρός περ ἐών*," the *α* and *ε* of *ἄψασθαι* and *ἄψεσθαι* being underlined.

395. *δ' ἴαχε.* "*δϝι*"

397. *ἐξέρυσ'.* "*Εκϝε*"

400. *ᾤκεον.* "*ϝοίκ*"

419. *μ' ἤλπετ'.* "*ϝέλ*"

429. "Hes. *Συντρεῖς αἶνυ*"

438. *ἐξέσσυτο.* "*σσύατ'*"

445. "Hesyc. *Λαχμῷ στειν.*"—"Eust. *Ἡρωδιανὸς λαχνῷ.* Etymol. *Σέλευκος Λαχνῷ.*"

452. *γ' ἄνακτος.* "*ϝά*"

454. *φρένας οἴνῳ.* "*να ϝοί*"

455. "*ὄλεθρον* Eust. *Ἔχρην εἰπεῖν Ὀλέθρου*, ut *ἀέθλων πεφ.* sed *μοῖραν, ἄμμε.*" *πεφυγμένος ἀέθλων*, *α* 18. *μοῖραν πεφυγμένον*, *Ζ* 488. *πεφυγμένον ἄμμε*, *Ψ* 219.

459. *κὰδ δὲ ἐμὸν κῆρ* (sic Steph.) "*κάδδε μεὸν | κάδδ' ἐμὸν ἦτορ.*"

468. *νεῦον ἑκάστῳ.* "*νεῦσα ϝεκ*"

482. *νεώς.* "*νεὸς*"

483. "Hesyc. *Ἐδεύησεν—ἤγισεν*, pro *ἤγγισεν.*"

485. *αἶψ'.* "Leg. *ἄψ.*"

497. *ἄκουσε.* "*ἀκούσῃ.*"

504. *πτολιπόρθιον ἐξαλαῶσαι.* "*θον σ' ἐξ*"

512. "Il. *Ζ*, 411"—"*ἀμερδέσκεσθαι υ*, 7" (for *ἁμαρτήσεσθαι*) postea deletum. *υ*, 7 is unintelligible to me, and I am not sure that I have read it aright. Mr Aldis Wright thinks *ἐμισγέσκοντο* (*υ*, 7) is referred to, to support *ἀμερδέσκεσθαι*.

516. *ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάωσεν.* "*ὀφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε.*" This can hardly be meant for a correction, rather as a quotation pointing to *ὀφθαλμοῦ μὲν ἄμερσεν* if anything. See *θ* 64.

530. *πτολιπόρθιον οἴκαδ'.* "*θον ϝοί*" ex MS.

531. Bracketed. "<C> LHLL deest."

532. *τ' ἰδέειν.* "*ϝι*"

536. *κυανοχαίτης.* "leg. *χαῖτα.*"

539. *νεώς.* "*νεὸς*"

542. *θέμωσε δὲ χέρσον ἱκέσθαι.* "fo. *κῦμ' ἀθέμωσε.* v. 486 Hesyc. Θέμωσε et 'Εθέμωσε. corr. | fo. *νῆσον ἵκ.*[1]"

549. *κίοι αἴσης.* "*κίε ϝίσης. κίοι αἴσης.*"

553. "*ἔκῃα* rectum, non *ἔκῃον.*" (*ἔκῃον* Steph. in marg.) *ἐμπάζετο ἰρῶν.* "*ϝι*" quo deleto "*τ' ἀρ ἰ—*"

κ.

8. "*ἀκοίτις* cas. ac. plur. ut *ἥνις.*" *ἀκοίτας* Steph.

31. "δ, 793" for *ἐπήλυθε* against *ὑπήλυθε.*

35. *οἴκαδ' ἄγεσθαι.* "fo. *εντὸς ἄγεσθαι, ἔνδον, ἔνδοθι.*"—"Il. *γ.* 404 an *ἔντος, ἔνθαδ'* ?"

36. *Αἰόλου.* "*αἰόλοφιν.*"

39. *ἀνθρώποις ὅτεων.* "*ποισιν* Il. *ο*, 664, et 493." (O 491. For scansion of *ὅτεων* as a dissyllable.)

41. *αὖτε ὁμὴν.* "*ϝο*" (*ϝομήν*), quo deleto, "*αὖ ϝοι*" (*αὖ ϝοι ὁμήν*).

44. *θᾶσσον ἰδώμεθα.* "*δεῦτε ϝιδώμεσθ'.*"

48. *αἶψ'* underlined.

60. *Αἰόλου.* "*αἰόλοφι,*" sub quo "*ἀϝιό*"-λου.—"Η *ὁ στίχος σφηκώδης.*"

68. *τοῖσί τε ὕπνος.* "leg. *τοίσδεσί θ' ὕπνος.* vel *τοῖσίν θ'* 268." vel *τοῖσιν θ'* deletum. 268 is to defend *τοίσδεσι.*

75. *ἔρρ' ἐπεὶ ἄρα θεοῖσιν.* "*Ἔρρ' ἐπειή ῥα θε*" at top of page: in margin "*ἀθανάτοισιν*" from HL, and "*ἐπειή ῥα*" again.

84. *ἄϋπνος ἀνήρ.* "Eust. ad Il. *ι.* pag 650 citat *ἄοκνος ἀνήρ.*"

[1] I suppose Bentley to have meant that if *θέμωσε* in 486 means *ἤγγισεν* (as Hesych. explains it)—brought the ship *near* to shore—here we want the opposite *ἀθέμωσε*, "drove the ship *far from* shore." The same sense is given by the other change of *χέρσον* to *νῆσον.*

87. "Hesyc. Λιμένα κλυτὸν—alij λιμέν' ἄκλυτον."

90. ἀραιή. "ϝα"

91. πάντες. "βάντες" ex MSS.

97. "Hesyc. Παιπαλόεσσαν—Ἔστην δὲ etc."

113. "Hesyc. κατὰ δ' ἔστυγεν, ἐμίσησεν, pro ον, σαν."

124. "πείροντες vi Hesyc. σκόλοψι." Eust. γρ. εἴροντες i.e. συνείροντες. γρ. ἰχθῦς δ' ἀσπαίροντας Didym. γρ. σπαίροντας et φέροντο."

φέροντο. "πένοντο μ 254, 5." The reference to μ is for ἀσπαίροντας.

127. νεώς. "νεός."

138. Etym. M. ἐγγέγατον. in ἐγγ."

149. ἐείσατο. "ϝεί"

162. ἀντικρύ. "κρὺς"

169. "Hesyc. Καταλοφάδια"—"Eust. πλείω ἀντιγράφων, καταλοφάδεια."

172. νεώς. "νεός."

178. ἐμοῖς. "μεοῖς."

190. τ' ἴδμεν. "ϝίδμεν."

194. εἶδον. "ϝεῖ"

204. ἠρίθμεον. "μευν"

208. εἴκοσ'. "ϝεί," quo deleto "ἐεί"

209. γοόωντας. "όϝω"

220. "310"

225. "θ'" after κήδιστος.

"L post 225 ὅ σφιν ἐϋφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν."

239. δέμας. "τρίχας."—"<C> LLLH Dio Chrys. Orat. 33, τρίχας τε, καὶ δέμας." Dio is not quoted by La Roche or Ludwich.

240. τρίχας. "δέμας."—"Eust. Text. δέμας καὶ τρίχας. Not. τρίχας καὶ δέμας."

241. τοῖσι δὲ Κίρκη. "An δῶκε δὲ Κίρκη."

242. Bracketed. "H. Ἀρίσταρχος οὐκ οἶδε τὸν στίχον. Καλλίστρατος δ' ἀντ' αὐτοῦ, Παντός με ὕλης ἐτίθει μελιηδέα καρπόν." See Ludwich on this and preceding line.

244. αἶψ' underlined.

247. βεβολημένος. "βλη"

249. "Hesych. *ἀγαζόμεθα, πλεονάζομεν.* leg. *ἐπλ—.* Didym. *ἀγαζό*"

253. Bracketed. "<C> LHLL deest."

265. Bracketed. "deest HLL."

268. "H *Ἀρίσταρχος σῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ Σῶον.*"

271. "Hes. *Ἐνιχώρ, ἐν τῷ χόρῳ.* leg. *Ἐνὶ χώρῳ—χώρῳ.*"

320. *λέξο ἑταίρων.* "*λέξο θ'*"

323. *ἰάχουσα ὑπέδραμε.* At top of page "*ἰάχουσ' ὑπό τ' ἔδραμε,*" in margin "*μ' ὑπ'*"

329. "Hesy. *ἀκηδιτον,* pro *ἀκήλητον.*"

337. *κέλῃ.* "*κέλεαι. δ,* 812."

343. *θεά.* "*θεῶν* 299."

352. "Etym. M. in *βάλλω—δόμοις ἔνι,*" for *θρόνοις.*

373. *ἐμῷ δ' οὐχ ἥνδανε θυμῷ.* "*ἐμοὶ* Il. *α,* 24 *οὐ ϝάν*"

378. *ἕζεαι ἶσος.* "*ϝῖσος* 337." 337 quoted for contraction of *κέλεαι* to defend contraction here of *ἕζεαι.*

385. "H *Ἀριστάρ. λύσασθ'* (ergo alij *λῦσαί θ'*)."

403. *πάμπρωτον ἐρύσσατε.* "*τα ϝερύσσασθ'*"

404. *κτήματα δ' ἐν σπήεσσι.* "H *ἔν τισι, κτ. δὲ σπήεσσι. καὶ κτή. ἐνὶ σπ.*"—"424"

405. *αἶψ'.* "*ἄψ.*"

409. "post 409 in marg. *Ἀσπάσιος δ' ἄρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνην κακότητος ἀλύξας.*" Reading of C. "L deest."

410. *πόρτιες* (sic Steph.) "fo. *πρότιες,*" then "*πόριες*" ex MSS.

417. *ἵνα τε τράφεν.* "H *ἵνα τέτραφεν.* Il. *ψ* 348."

423. *πάμπρωτον ἐρύσσομεν.* "*τα ϝε*"

425. *ὀτρύνεσθε.* "*νεσθαι η,* 222."

428. *ἐμοῖς.* "*μεοῖς.*"

456. Bracketed. "<C> HL deest."

458. *ἄλγεα ἰχθυόεντι.* "an *ἄλγε' ἀμιχθαλόεντι.*"

465. "Eust. *Ἀρίσταρχος πέπασθε,* i.e. *κέκτησθε.*"

470. Bracketed.

493. "leg. *Μαντίοφιν ἀλαοῦ* vel *ϝαλαοῦ.*"

497. "*δ* 540" for *οὐδέ νύ μοι κῆρ* (CL) against *οὐδέ τι θυμός.* (Steph.)

499. *τε κορέσθην.* "*τ' ἐκ δ* 542." (*δ* 541.)

500. *καὶ τότε δή μιν ἔπεσσιν.* "*ϝε ϝέπεσσι*"—"*ϝεπέεσσι*"

501. *γάρ.* "*τ' ἄρ* Il. *α*, 8."
502. *δ'* underlined.
509. "Hes. *Ἄλσεα*, ubi *λιμένων* pro *λειμώνων*."
τε λάχεια. "*τ' ἐλάχεια*—Eust. *γρ. τ' ἐλάχεια*."
520. "Hes. *παλύνας*—*Ἐπὶ δ'* etc."
521. "Hesyc. *Ἀμένηνα* etc."
525. *ἠμετέροισιν.* (sic Steph.) *ἠμ* underlined.
539. "Hes. *ὥς κέν τοι* in *ὡς*."
555. "Hes. *ψύχεος ἰμ.*"
559. *καταντικρύ.* Last three letters underlined.
572. "L *κατέθηκεν* vide λ, 4."

λ.

2. *πάμπρωτον ἐρύσσαμεν.* "*τα ϝε*"
6. *νεώς.* "*νεὸς*"
14. "Etym. M. alij *κεμμερίων*, alij *χειμερίων*, alij *κερβερίων*. Vide et Hesych. *τινὲς παρ' Ὁμήρῳ κερβερίων γράφουσι.* *σχολ.* ad Batrach. Aristoph. p. 157 Eust. *γρ. χειμερίων.* Κράτης Κερβερίων. Hesyc. Κερβέριοι, et Κιμμέριοι. Aristoph. Ranis *εἰς Κερβερίους.*"
16. "*ἐπιλάμπεται ἀκτ.* Strabo p. 5. sed p. 244 *ἐπιδέρκεται.*"
25. *ὄρυξα ὅσον τε.* "*ὄρυξ' ὅσσον τε*"
38—43. Bracketed. "Eust. *τὰ ἐξ ἔπη ἀθετοῦσιν οἱ παλαιοί.*"
61. Bracketed originally, but the brackets being deleted "*ὕπνος*" is suggested for *οἶνος.* *ὕπνος* Stob. Anth. I 49, 53 (Ludwich), but Bentley's appears to be a conjecture.
64. *ἀντικρύ.* "*κρὺς*"
86. *εἰς Ἴλιον.* "*ἐς Ϝί*"
91. "Hesyc. *χρύσεον σκῆ*"
94. "Hesych. *Ἀπόχασον*" corrupted from *ἀποχάζεο.*
99. *μ' ἐπέεσσι.* "*με ϝέπεσσι.*"
113. *καὶ ἑτάροις.* "*σοῖς θ'*" *ἑτάροις.*
115. *ἐν.* "*ἐνὶ*"
116. "*σχολ.* Pind. Olym. 8 *κατέδουσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ κατεδοῦνται. οὐδέπω γὰρ παρῆσαν οἱ μνηστῆρες, ὅτε ἐσφαγίαζεν ὁ ὀδυσσεύς.*"
122. *οὐκ ἴσασι.* "*οὐ ϝί*"

127. "Hesyc. *ἄλλος ὁδ. ἀλλόφυλος.*"

134. "*ἐξ ἁλός. ἔξω*; q[d] Ulyssi gratum, ob pericula a mari." —"Lucianus in *Ἔρωτες. οἱ ἐρέται τὸ σκάφος ἔξαλον ἐς γῆν ἀνασπάσαντες.*"—"Hesyc. *ἐξ ἁλός, ἔξω τῆς θαλάσσης.*"

142. "*οὐδὲ ϝόν. οὐδ' ἑόν.*"

144. "leg. *ἀνγνοίη τοῖον.* sic δ. 250. ξ, 218."—"*εἶπε, ἄναξ, ὅππως κέ μ' ἀναγνοίη τὸν ἐόντα.*" Steph. has *μ' ἀναγνοίη.* (ξ 118.)

146. *τοι ἔπος.* "*γε ϝεπ*"

147. *κεν ἐᾷς.* "*κ' ἐάας.*"

157—159. Bracketed. "*οἱ τρεῖς ἀθετοῦνται* Didym. Certe debuit *ἱκέσθαι* dicere, non *ὁρᾶσθαι.*" *ὁρᾶσθαι* however is in 156.

158. "Plutarch de Orbe Lunae p. 1729; *Ἀλλὰ σὺ τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον ἀγαπῶν ἀεὶ καὶ θαυμάζων, οὐκ ἀκούεις Κράτητος ἀναγινώσκων* (leg. *νώσκοντος*)

Ὠκεανός θ' ὅσπερ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται
Ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ θεοῖς, πλείστην ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἴησιν."

162. *οὐδ' εἶδες.* "*ἦ ϝεῖδες.*"

174. *ὅν.* "*οὓς*"—"Η Ἀριστοφάνης Οὕς."

186. *ἃς ἐπέοικε.* "*ἅς τε ϝέοικε.*"

190. *δμῶες* "*γ'*" *ἐνί.*

194. "Etym. M. *κεκλιμένων*, alij *κεκλαμένων* pro *κεκλασμένων* Vide Hesych. *κεκλαμένων.*"

200. *οἷν.* "*αὖ.*"

207. *σκιῇ εἴκελον.* "*ϝίκελον σκιῇ.*"

213. *ἦ τί μοι εἴδωλον.* "*ἤ μοι ϝειδ* vel *ἠέ τι ϝείδ*"

235. "Eustath. in textu *πρῶτον*, in notis *πρώτην.*"

238. "Strabo p. 356 Alij dicunt *Ἐνισῆος* de Thessaliae fluvio, de hoc Elidis *Ἐνιπῆος.*"

241. *ἄρα εἰσάμενος.* "*ϝει* (*ἄρ' ἐει*)"

249. *τέκνα ἐπεί.* The *a* deleted (*τέκν' ἐπεί*).

256. *Ἰαολκῷ.* "*αϝο*"

264. *οὐ μέν.* "*οὔ μιν* Pausan. Boeot."

271. *καλὴν Ἐπικάστην.* "Hes. *καλήν τ'* etc."

273. "Pausan. Boeot. *νίεῖ ὁ δ' ὅν,*" in margin "*ϝῷ νἱ'. ὁ δὲ ϝόν.*"

274. "Hesyc. Ἀνάπαυστα et Ἀνάπυστα."

275. *πάσχων.* "*πέσσων*" postea deletum.

276. *ἤνασσε.* "*ἐράν*"

279. "Hesy. *ᾧ ἄχεϊ σχο.*"

280. "Hes. *Μητρὸς ἐριννύες.*"

282. "Sic Dion. *τέχνη* p. 523"
μυρία ἔδνα. "*ι' ἔεδνα.*"

284. *Μινυηΐῳ ἶφι.* "*Μινυείῳ ϝῖφι.* Il. B, 511."

287. *Πηρώ.* "Etym. M. in *ἐλεγειΐς*, vocat eam *Πειρώ*."

296. "Hesiod Ἀσπ. v. 54 *Αὐτὰρ Ἰφικλῆά γε δορυσσόῳ Ἀμφιτρύωνι.* lego *Αὐτὰρ Ϝιφικλῆα δορ.*"

297. *πάντ' εἰπόντα.* "*ϝοι ϝείπ*"

304. *λελόγχασιν ἶσα.* "*λέλογχαν ϝῖ*"

305. *δὲ μετ' Ἰφιμέδειαν.* "*μετὰ Ϝιφ*"—"600" (now 601) —"*Ἀμφι*" *μέδειαν* "*Η ἀμφιμέδ.*"

306. *εἴσιδον.* "*Ἔσϝι*"

312. *ἐννεόργυιοι.* "Aeolismo: *ἐννορόγυιοι* ut Sappho."

325. Bracketed. "Spurius. semper alias *Διώνυσος* cum *ω* magno." "Etym. M. *διώνυσος*, semper apud Homerum per *ω̄*, sic Herodianus. *σχολ.* Apollon. 3, 996. *ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲ ἤγαγεν (ἀριάδνην) εἰς ἀθήνας, τελευτῆσαι δὲ καταλειφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ θησέως, ὅμηρος μαρτυρεῖ—φαίδραν τε—Κούρην—ἣν ποτε θησεὺς Γήμας οὐδ' ἀπόνητο.*" "Hesyc. *Μαρτυρίῃσι, βουλήσεσι.*"

327. *φίλου ἀνδρός.* "forte *πρὸ ϝοῦ ἀνδρός.*"

337. *τε ἰδέ.* "*τ' ἠδέ.*"

340. "Hesyc. *Κολούεται, ἐλαττοῦται. τε τε,*" i.e. leg. in Hes. *κολούετε, ἐλαττοῦτε.*

359. *πλειοτέρῃ σὺν χειρί.* "*σιν χερσί.*"—"Η *Ἀριστοφ. Πλειοτέρῃσιν χερσί.*"—"Hes. *Πλειοτέρῃ σὺν χειρί.*"

363. *τὸ μὲν οὔ τί σ' ἐΐσκομεν.* "*σὲ μὲν οὔτι ϝεϊ, τὸ μὲν οὔ σε ϝ*"

364. *πολλούς.* "*πολλὰ* 535" (now 536). "L *πολλά.*"

367. "*θ*, 170"

371. *οἵ τοι ἅμ' αὐτῷ.* "fo. *οἵ τέ τοι αὐτῷ.*"

386. *ἀγνὴ Περσεφόνεια.* "*αἰνή*, ut *ἐπαινῆς.*" v. l. pro *ἀγνή* in marg. Steph. Bentley also refers to Eustathius for it.

399—403. Bracketed. "Η *οἱ πέντε ἀθετοῦνται ὑπὸ ἀριστ.* &c."

407. Bracketed. "L deest."

421. *ἤκουσα ὅπα.* "an *ἤκουσας*, ut *ὀλοφύραο*" (418). "*ἠκούσα᾽ ὅπα* Il. *o.* 96." O 96 seems quoted for middle *ἀκούσεαι*, but that is future. Bentley first suggested "*ϝό"πα*, which is then deleted.

432. *λύγρ᾽ εἰδυῖα.* "*γρα ϝι*"

439. *ἐόντι.* "fo. *ἰόντι.*"

442. *μηδ᾽ οἱ.* "*Μή ϝοι*"—"*δϝοι*"

450. *ὄψεται.* "*εαι* 555" (now 556).

474. *μήσεαι ἔργον.* "*σαο ϝέρ*"

483. *μακάρτατος.* "*τερος*"

484. *ἐτίομεν ἶσα.* "*ἔτιον ϝῖσα. χ.* 370."

485. *μέγα.* "*μετὰ*"

489. *ἐπάρουρος.* "Etym. in *Ἐπαρ.* alij *κε πάρουρος*, sed *Βέλτιον ἐπάρουρος.*"

490. "Hesych. *ἀκλήρῳ, ἔχων τι* etc. leg. *ἔχοντι.*"

521. *Κήτειοι κτείνοντο.* "fo. *Ἰθέοι κτ.* vel *Χήτει* vel potius *Κήδειοι.* vide Eust. et Hesych."—"*o*, 247," this for *γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων.*

522. "*γε ϝίδον*" i.e. *κεῖνον κάλλιστόν γε ϝίδον* for *κεῖνον δὴ κ. ἴδον. δὴ* is marked underneath for deletion.

526. "*Η Ἀριστ. Ἐνθ᾽ ἄλλοι πάντες κατὰ Δούρεον ἵππον Ἀχαιοί.*"

530. *με.* "*μοι*"—*ἱκέτευεν.* "*ἐκέλευεν ἐπέτελλεν.*"

539. *φοίτα.* "*Ὤιχετο*" "*Η φοίτα ᾤχετο.*"—"Eust. *γρ. κατὰ σφοδελόν. γρ. καὶ σποδελόν.*"

542. *κήδε᾽ ἑκάστη.* "fo. *κῆρα ϝεκ*"—"*ἀπᾶσαι.*"

550. "*δϝέργα*"

561. *ἴν᾽ ἔπος.* "fo. *ἵνα πως.*"—"*ὅπα μ*, 185 Il. *γ.* 221. *λ*, 137." *ὅπα* for *ἔπος.*

562. *καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμόν.* "Plutarch. Sympos. 9, 5—*καὶ ἀτειρέα θυμόν.*"

569. *νεκύεσσιν* (Steph.). "*νέκυσσιν.* Strabo 150."

580. "*ϝέλκυσσε*"—"Hes. *ἥλκησε.* sed rectum *εἵλκυσθε.* Hom. *ἑλκυσθείσας τε θύγατρας.*" The word *rectum* defied me, but has yielded at length to Mr Aldis Wright and Dr Jackson. Bentley apparently wrote *ἥλκησε*, not *ἥλκ.*

582. "*εσϝει*" *-δον.*

586. "*ἀναβροχὲν* Hesych."

587. "Hes. *καταζένασκε* et *Ἀνεξηνάσκετο* et *Κατεζήνασκε*."

592. "Sic Od. *θ*, 374 *ῥίπτασκε ποτὶ νέφεα σκιόεντα*."

593. *εἰσεῖδον*. "*εσρε*"—"Pindari *σχολ.* p. 13 *Ὅμηρος Τάνταλον ἑτέρως ὑποτίθησι τιμωρεῖσθαι. ἑσταότ' ἐν λίμνῃ—πιέειν δ' οὐκ εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς πλὴν εἰ μὴ κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον νόθα ἐστὶ τὰ ἔπη ταῦτα*."

594. "Hesyc. *ῥαστάζειν, ὠθεῖν*: sic *ῥυστάζειν, ῥαιστάζειν*." In margin "*ῥας*" for *βαστάζοντα*.

595. "Hes. *Σκηριπτάμενος*." I find only *σκηριπτόμενος* and *-ούμενος* in Hesychius.

602—4. Bracketed. "Versus nothi. vide Il. *θ*, 365. Nusquam Herculis mentio in *θεῶν μάχῃ*. nusquam de Hebe. ut ejus uxore. Ipse *αἰσυλόεργος* etc. Nusquam alibi *χρυσοπέδιλος*. Lucianus Dial. Diog. et Herculis agnoscit hos versus."

602. "*ϝείδωλόν γ'*"—"Plut. p. xxv."

608. *ἐοικώς*. "lege *αἰεὶ βαλέοντι ἐῴκει*. Patet ex L ms^to^. —"LH *ἐῴκει*."

614. "*γ'*" inserted; whether before or after *ἐῇ* uncertain. "*Γεῇ τῇ γῇ*. Vel lege *ϝεῇ, τῇ ῇ*. vel *Γαίῃ, τῇ γῇ*." See Hesychius.

640. "Eust. *τὰ παλαιὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων, εἱρεσίῃ δοτικῇ*."

μ.

22. "Hes. in *Ὅτε—Δισθάνεες* etc."

36. *μ' ἐπέεσσι*. "*με ϝεπ*"

45. "Hesyc. *θίν,—ὀστρεόφιν*."

51. *πείρατ'*. "an *ραρ*?"

54. *ἐνί*. "*ἔτι* 164."

64. "fo. *ἀφαιρεῖταί τινα πέτρη*."

70. *πᾶσι μέλουσα*. "Eust. *γρ. φασιμελοῦσα*, a Phaside fluvio."

71. *βάλεν*. "*βάλον*."

77. "forte, *οὐδ' ἀποβαίη*, vel *οὐδὲ καβαίη*. Aeol. Hesych. *κάβασι, κατάβηθι, Λάκωνες* et *καβλέει, καταπίνει* et Hom. Il. *ζ*, 164 *κάκτανε*."—"*ἦ*" for *οὐ*.—"Eust. *γρ. οὐδ' ἐπιβαίη*, q^d^ *γελοῖον*."

78. "τέ γ' ἐεί"-κοσι.

81. ἦπερ ἄν. "ἦχί περ."

82. παρά. "πάρος Il. μ, 33."

84. "Hesyc. ἄωροι et 'Αούρους."

94. ἐξίσχει. "ἓξ ἴσχει" from margin of Stephanus and Eustathius.

100. νεώς. "νεός."

105. "Hesyc. 'Αναροιβδεῖ."—"τρίς. imo δίς, τάχα τῆς γραφῆς διημαρτημένης. Strabo. p. 4. et 25 τρίς, γραφικὸν ἁμάρτημα pro δὶς sed pag. 43 τρὶς ad augendum terrorem. Ovid Pont. IV. 10. Charybdin, Ter licet epotum ter vomat illa fretum."

111. ἀμειβόμενος. "ἀτυζόμενος" ex L.

117. θεοῖσιν ὑπείξεαι. "οἷς ὑποϝεί"

124—6. Bracketed. "H ἀθετοῦνται γ̄."

130. δ' ἕκαστα. "ϝέ"

147. Bracketed. "L deest H."

148. νεώς. "νεός."

154. οἴους. "οἴω."

162. πείρατ'. Last three letters underlined; see above on 51.

197, 8. οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔπειτα Φθογγῆς σειρήνων ἠκούομεν. "f. ἔπειτ' ἦν φθ. σειρήνοιιν ἀκουέμεν. non enim ἠκούομεν, sed Ulixes solus."

219. "Hes. Νέεργε, μεῖε, χώριζε." i.e. leg. ἔεργε in Hes.

222. ἐμοῖς. "μεοῖς."

231. μοι underlined.

236. ἀνερροίβδησε. "fo. ἀναρροιβδοῦσα."

237. "Quaere an ἐκϝεμέσειε? ἐμῶ, uomo."

238. "Hesyc. ἀναμορμ.—ἀνετάραττεν pro ἀνέβραττεν."

242. "Hesyc. 'Εβεβρήκει."

250. ἀχνύμενοι. "an ἀχνύμενον."

252. κατά. "κάτω."

254. ἀσπαίροντα δ' ἔπειτα. "fo. ἀσπαίροντας."

255. ποτί. "προτί."

258. ἐμοῖς. "μεοῖς."

267. μάντιος. "τιοφιν."

281. "ϝα"-δηκότας. "Hesych. 'Αδήκορες. lege ἀδηκότες."

288. *ἔλθῃ.* "*θῃσ'*"

290. "an *θεῶν ἀνάκτων*, id est *διοσκούρων*. an *ἀνάκτων*, ut *κώπης ἄναξ*. vel *θοήν*." (*νῆα—θοήν*).—"*θοῶν*" for *θεῶν*.—"Η Ζηνόδοτος, *φίλων ἀεκ. ἑταίρων*."

317. *εἰσερύσαντες.* "*ἐσρε*"

329. *ἐξέφθιτο ἥϊα.* "leg. *ἥϊ' ἐξέφθιτο*."—"*ἐξέφθιθεν ψ.* 331. vel, propius, *ἐξεφθίατ'* Il. *α*, 251."

335. *ἥλυξα ἑταίρους.* "an *ἥλυξα ϝεκάστους*. an *ἑτάρους ἥλυξα*. Immo *ἥλυσκον*."

347. *ἀγάλματα.* "Hes. male *Ἀτάλματα*."

348. *τι.* "*κε*"

349. *ἐθέλῃ.* "*λῃσ'*"—*ἔσπονται* (sic Steph.). "*ἔψονται*"—"*ἔψονται* Il. *δ*. 63 et Hesych."

355. *βοσκέσκονθ' ἕλικες.* "*βόσκοντο ϝέ*"

372. "leg. *νηδύμῳ ὕπ.* 366, 311, 338. *Νηλέϊ ὕπνῳ* nusquam alibi."

383. "*δύσομαι.* Praes. temp."—*φαείνω.* "an *-είνων*?" postea deletum. Apparently Bentley first changed to *φαείνων* to avoid what he thought an impossible collocation of tenses; then changed his mind, crossed out *φαείνων*, and explained *δύσομαι* as a present. Yet this seems incredible.

397. *ἐμοί.* "*μεοί*."

398. *ἐλάσαντες.* "*ἐλόωντες*" ex marg. Steph. ἑλ. not ἐλ. both Stephanus and Bentley.

402. "*ι*, 77."

406. "Il. *η*, 64."

417. "Hesyc. *θείου πλῆτο*."

419. *ἀποαίνυτο.* "*οϝαί*"

423. "Athen. XIV *Ἐπίτονος τετάνυστο βοὸς ἶφι κταμένοιο*"—"*Ἐπίτονος* semel venit apud Homerum. vide Hesyc."

424. "Hes. *ἀπ' ἰκρίοφιν*."

435. "Hes. *ἀπήωροι*."

439. "Strabo 44 *ἦμός τ'*."

441. "Strabo 44. *καὶ τότε δή μοι δοῦρα*."

446. "*εσρι*"

THE CHRONOLOGY OF XENOPHON'S HELLENICA, 387 to 362 B.C.

It will be convenient to treat of the chronology of this period in two parts, the first extending from the Peace of Antalcidas, which seems to have been finally ratified[1] late in 387 B.C., to the Battle of Leuctra in 371, the date of which is sufficiently certain; and the second comprising the interval between the Battles of Leuctra and Mantinea.

Part I. 387 to 371 B.C.

In this section the chronology of the first seven or eight years is extremely doubtful. We have to content ourselves with the dates and arrangement of Diodorus, except in so far as they can be corrected from the order observed by Xenophon in recording the same events. The chronology of the last eight years can be determined with much greater certainty, since we are here no longer mainly dependent upon Diodorus. Xenophon himself gives several definite marks of time, fixing the events of at least four successive years, 378–375. Two Attic inscriptions are of great importance; the first[2], dated the archonship of Nausinicus 378/7, deals with the affairs of the Second Athenian Confederacy: the second[3], dated the archonship of Hippodamas 375/4, practically settles, as will be seen, the date of Timotheus' expedition round the Peloponnesus. The speech of Apollodorus (Demosthenes) contr. Timotheum fixes the date of Timotheus' second command to April 373, and his

[1] cp. Journal of Philology xxii. p. 147.

[2] CIA. ii. 17.

[3] CIA. ii. 49.

trial to November of the same year. Demosthenes (contr. Neæram 1357) and Plutarch (v. Agesil. 28) agree in assigning the battle of Leuctra to the year 371, the latter giving the day of the month as the fifth of Hecatombæon, viz. July 6 or 8.

The data for arranging the events of the successive years will be given under each year, beginning with 386. As many references will be made to the years of the archons in Diodorus, at this point it may be as well to recall the fact that the 1st of Hecatombæon, the day on which these magistrates entered office, fell in these 25 years on various dates, ranging from the 22nd of June to the 22nd of July. In his annalistic treatment Diodorus always prefixes the name of the eponymous archon and of the Roman consuls to the history of each year, which he begins apparently about midwinter. But for his Greek history he seems to have used the work of some chronologist, who dated events strictly by the Athenian archonships. Naturally this led to confusion, and almost more often than not Diodorus in his carelessness puts events, if in the right year, yet under the wrong archon; or if under the right archon, yet in the wrong year. Frequently, of course, he is mistaken in both.

386 B.C. Sparta[1] seems to have occupied the whole of this year in enforcing the provisions of the 'King's Peace,' of which she was the originator and had been constituted the champion.

385 B.C. Clinton is apparently right in assigning the siege[2] of Mantinea by Agesipolis to this year, though the data are very unsatisfactory and even contradictory. Xenophon would seem to imply that the siege began in the year after the expiration of the Thirty Years' Peace between Sparta and Mantinea. Now we know from Thucydides[3] that it was concluded in the winter 418/7, so that it must have expired in the winter 388/7. Xenophon ought therefore to mean, that the war broke out in 386 at latest. It is noticeable that in § 4 he implies that the siege did not last a very long time.

Diodorus[4] puts the war in the archonship of Mystichides 386/5, i.e. in 386, thus agreeing with Xenophon. However he

[1] v. 1. 36.
[2] v. 2. 1—7.
[3] v. 81.
[4] xv. 2, 5.

contradicts himself by saying[1] of the Spartans *οὐδὲ δύο ἔτη φυλάξαντες τὰς κοινὰς σπονδάς*, since in this very chapter he assigns the declaration of war to the *first* year after the Peace of Antalcidas. Then he makes the siege end under the archonship of Dexitheus 385/4 i.e. 385, thus regarding it as lasting some 18 months. Probably therefore the best way out of the difficulty is to take 385 as the year for the whole campaign, the beginning of which may very well have been in the last months of Mystichides' archonship, May or June, and the end in the first half of Dexitheus' archonship, September or October. In this case we must not press too strictly the date of the termination of the Thirty Years' Peace: in fact Xenophon himself (§ 2) introduces it with an *ἐλέγοντο*. Moreover some 18 months between the final ratification of the Peace of Antalcidas and the actual renewal of hostilities *à priori* does not appear too long.

384 B.C. The action of the Phliasian exiles to procure their own restoration was, Xenophon[2] tells us, occasioned by the fate of Mantinea, which surrendered, as we have seen, in the autumn of the previous year. This event therefore falls most naturally into the succeeding year, or better perhaps in the winter months 385/4.

383 B.C. If the next events recorded by Xenophon be rightly assigned by Clinton and Grote to 382, the historian records no events of this year.

382 B.C. The events[3] in question are (*a*) the appearance of Acanthian and Ambraciot envoys at Sparta to ask for help against Olynthus (which may probably be put in the winter or early spring), and the resolution of the Lacedæmonians and their allies to accede to the request; (*b*) the preliminary expedition of Eudamidas *ὡς τάχιστα* (§ 23) after this resolution and the surprise of the Cadmea by his brother Phœbidas, while he was on his march, *θέρους ὄντος* (§ 29), to join him.

E. Curtius, E. von Stern[4], and others assign these events to the year 383. There seem to be only two arguments for so doing: (*a*) Xenophon is silent about any intermediate events

[1] xv. 5. [2] v. 2. 8—10. [3] v. 2. 11—43.

[4] Spartan. u. Theban. Hegemonie. Dorpat, 1884. p. 34.

between the Phliasian affair and the embassy of the Acanthians and Ambraciots; (*b*) Diodorus[1] records this embassy under the year of Phanostratus 383/2 i.e. 383. The first argument is of little or no weight. The second argument is quite valueless, because Diodorus[2] puts the capture of the Cadmea in the archonship of Evander 382/1, whereas it is plain from Xenophon's narrative, that the two events must have occurred in the same Julian year: in fact the testimony of Diodorus ought rather to be used against this theory, the embassy falling in the last six months of Phanostratus and the capture of the Cadmea in the first six months of Evander—an arrangement which accounts for the confusion in Diodorus in the usual fashion.

On the other side, in favour of the year 382 may be urged (*a*) the passages in Diodorus already cited; (*b*) the testimony of the orator Aristides[3], Πυθίων ὄντων ἡ Καδμεία κατελήφθη; (*c*) the fact that the succeeding events in Xenophon's narrative fall in better with the year 382 than 383. As to the first argument enough has already been said. From the passage in Aristides it would follow that the capture of the Cadmea took place about August 382; for it is generally agreed that the Pythian festival was held every third Olympic year; the month however is more uncertain. Most authorities are in favour of August, and this does not seem to be inconsistent with Xenophon's θέρους ὄντος, though it must be confessed that July would suit better. An attempt, it may be here noticed, has been made to impugn Xenophon's testimony as to the season of the year altogether on the ground that he speaks[4] of the Thebans celebrating the Thesmophoria in the summer, whereas the festival was really celebrated in October or November. It is quite true that the *Athenians* held the Thesmophoria in October or November: but there is absolutely no evidence, except this passage, to show at what time the Thebans were accustomed to hold it. That the seasons might vary, is plain from the fact that at Syracuse the festival was celebrated in the spring[5].

[1] xv. 15, 19.
[2] xv. 20.
[3] i. p. 258.
[4] v. 2. 29. θεσμοφοριάζειν, θέρους δὲ ὄντος κ.τ.λ.
[5] Diodorus v. 4.

As to the third argument—the capture of the Cadmea was followed in the same summer by the trial and execution of Ismenias. Then without any break Xenophon[1] continues *τούτων δὴ πεπραγμένων οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι πολὺ δὴ προθυμότερον τὴν εἰς τὴν Ὄλυνθον στρατιὰν συναπέστελλον.* Accordingly they send out Teleutias as harmost in command of *τὴν εἰς τοὺς μυρίους σύνταξιν*, and after various military operations *τοῦτο μὲν στρατευσάμενος τὸ θέρος διῆκε κ.τ.λ.* Stern, Curtius, &c. interpose the winter of 383/2 between the execution of Ismenias and the departure of Teleutias. Here not only is it much more natural to regard *τοῦτο τὸ θέρος* of § 43 as the same as the *θέρους ὄντος* of § 29; but it seems absurd to suppose that after solemnly resolving in the early spring that each state should send *τὸ εἰς τοὺς μυρίους σύνταγμα* for the summer's campaign, the Spartans and their allies waited a whole year before carrying their resolution into effect—especially when we read that after the Theban affair they all acted *πολὺ προθυμότερον* § 37, and that Teleutias actually took with him this *τὴν εἰς τοὺς μυρίους σύνταξιν.* Surely the narrative implies that immediately after sending out Eudamidas' preliminary expedition—for Xenophon carefully notes that Phœbidas only followed his brother with *τοὺς ὑπολειπομένους τῶν ἑαυτῷ* (i.e. Eudamidas) *προστεταγμένων*, not with the main army—steps were taken to organize the larger force, and this being ready to hand Teleutias conducted it against Olynthus as soon as the affair of the Cadmea was settled.

381 B.C. *Ἅμα δὲ τῷ ἦρι ὑποφαινομένῳ*[2] Teleutias began anew operations against Olynthus: then after several skirmishes *προιόντος τοῦ χρόνου* (§ 3) he was slain and the whole besieging force was obliged to disperse.

Diodorus[3] assigns the death of Teleutias to the archonship of Evander 382/1 i.e. to the same year as the capture of the Cadmea. Xenophon proves that this is too soon, though it is quite possible that his death may have occurred in the last month of Evander i.e. circ. June 381. Diodorus goes on to attribute to Agesipolis a whole year (i.e. 381) spent in petty skirmishes. Xenophon leaves it indeterminate, whether

[1] v. 2. 37. [2] v. 3. 1. [3] xv. 21, 22.

Agesipolis set sail as soon as possible after the death of Teleutias, i.e. August or September 381, or whether he waited till the spring of 380. He implies[1] however that the Spartan government met the emergency with all possible vigour, so that, combining this with Diodorus, we cannot go far wrong in preferring the earlier date.

380, 379 B.C. Xenophon[2] marks exactly the time of Agesipolis' death with the words *κατὰ θέρους ἀκμήν*. This agrees with Diodorus[3], who not only puts the occurrence under the archonship of Pytheas 380/379, but adds that he had reigned for 14 years, and was succeeded by Cleombrotus, who reigned for 9 years. Now Cleombrotus was slain at Leuctra in July 371, so that once more we arrive at the year 380. Polybiades[4] was sent out as harmost to take the command at Olynthus: although he prosecuted the war with vigour, he was obliged to starve the town into a surrender. This must necessarily have been somewhat a lengthy process, so that the capitulation cannot well be dated earlier than the first half of 379. This date agrees well enough with Diodorus, who assigns it to the same archonship as the death of Agesipolis, i.e. Pytheas 380/379. Moreover it appears from Xenophon's narrative that it took place just after or simultaneously with the reduction of Phlius. This is an unusually safe inference, because it is evident from the way that Xenophon in this chapter leaves events at Olynthus to record what was going on at Phlius, then goes back to Olynthus, again to Phlius, and once more to Olynthus that he is strictly following their relative chronological order. In § 25 he definitely states that the Phliasian affair lasted 20 months. It appears from its order in his narrative, that the complication began between Agesipolis' departure for Olynthus circ. August or September 381 and his death in July 380. For the same reason[5] we gather that the actual siege of the town began before the death of Agesipolis and continued after it. If therefore we assume the complication to have arisen about October 381 and

[1] v. 3. 8.
[2] v. 3. 19.
[3] xv. 23.
[4] v. 3. 20.
[5] v. 3. 17, 19, 21.

the surrender to have taken place about March or April 379, no very wide margin for error will be left. Olynthus, as we have seen already, fell at the same date or just afterwards. Diodorus[1] affords us no help for the Phliasian affair. He compresses it into one year 383 and dismisses it in a couple of lines.

379/378 B.C. winter. It is beyond all doubt that the Cadmea was recovered from the Spartans about the winter solstice 379/8. Xenophon[2] records the event next in order after the surrender of Phlius and Olynthus. Immediately on receipt of the news the ephors sent out Cleombrotus *μάλα χειμῶνος ὄντος* (§ 14). Plutarch also[3] says *ἦν νιφετός*, and in another passage[4], that it was a little after the surrender of Phlius. Moreover this date is indirectly confirmed by monumental evidence: for Xenophon affords us data, which exactly determine the four successive years 378–375, and the last of them is fixed by an inscription[5]. Diodorus[6] therefore is manifestly wrong in putting the recovery of the Cadmea under the archonship of Nausinicus 378/7, though, if it happened as late as January 378, which is quite possible, his mistake is easily accounted for: in fact on his system it is hardly a mistake at all.

378–375 B.C. Three passages in Xenophon determine these years exactly. In v. 4. 56 we read of the Thebans *μάλα πιεζόμενοι σπάνει σίτου διὰ τὸ δυοῖν ἐτοῖν μὴ εἰληφέναι καρπὸν ἐκ τῆς γῆς*. Then § 58 *ὑποφαίνοντος δὲ πάλιν τοῦ ἦρος* Cleombrotus led an expedition against the Thebans, which never reached its destination. Finally in § 63 we learn that the Thebans had leisure to subject their neighbouring cities *ἅτε εἰς τὰς Θήβας οὐκ ἐμβεβληκότων τῶν πολεμίων οὔτ' ἐν ᾧ Κλεόμβροτος ἦγε τὴν στρατιὰν ἔτει οὔτ' ἐν ᾧ Τιμόθεος περιέπλευσε*. The two years alluded to in the first passage, it appears from the context, are the two years immediately following the recovery of the Cadmea viz. 378, 377; and the two years of the last passage are 376, 375, the last of which, as

[1] xv. 19.
[2] v. 4. 1.
[3] v. Pelop. 9.
[4] v. Agesil. 24.
[5] CIA. ii. 49.
[6] xv. 25.

before mentioned, is confirmed by an inscription. The events of these years can thus be fixed with ease.

378 B.C. v. 4. 13—18. Cleombrotus' expedition against the Thebans in January or February.

v. 4. 20—24. Sphodrias' unsuccessful attempt upon the Piræus.

v. 4. 35—41. Agesilaus' first invasion of Bœotia.

This chronology is indirectly but strongly confirmed by the inscription CIA. ii. 17. Xenophon[1] tells us that after the departure of Sphodrias *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπύλωσάν τε τὸν Πειραιᾶ ναῦς τε ἐναυπηγοῦντο τοῖς τε Βοιωτοῖς πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ ἐβοήθουν*. This inscription, dated the archonship of Nausinicus 378/7, shows the outcome of this activity in the enlistment of many new allies into the Athenian maritime confederacy, including the Thebans.

377 B.C. *ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔαρ ἐπέστη* (§ 47), Agesilaus marched out on his second expedition into Bœotia.

Diodorus[2] it may here be noted compresses Agesilaus' two expeditions into one, which he assigns together with the first declaration of war to the archonship of Callias 377/6.

376 B.C. *ὑποφαίνοντος πάλιν τοῦ ἦρος* (§ 58) Cleombrotus commanded the Lacedæmonian forces.

Chabrias (§ 61) defeated the admiral Pollis, and the Lacedæmonian fleet—at Naxos according to Plutarch[3] *τῇ ἕκτῃ ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ βοηδρομιῶνος*, c. Sept. 10.

Diodorus[4] puts this victory a year too soon.

375 B.C. v. 4. 63—66. Timotheus sailed round Peloponnesus, winning Corcyra and *τὰς περὶ ἐκεῖνα πόλεις* over to the Athenian confederacy. This date is verified by the inscription (CIA. ii. 49) dated the archonship of Hippodamas, 375/4, which records the inclusion of the Corcyræans, Acarnanians, and Cephallenians in the Athenian confederacy. If Polyænus[5] is to be trusted and the festival of *Σκίρα* is the same as the *Σκιροφόρια*, Timotheus defeated the Spartan admiral off Leucas or, as Xenophon[6] says, at Alyzia, about the month of June.

[1] v. 4. 34.
[2] xv. 28—32.
[3] v. Camill. 19 and v. Phocion. 6.
[4] xv. 34.
[5] iii. 10. 4.
[6] v. 4. 66.

374, 373 B.C. From a comparison of Xenophon v. 4. 63 and vi. 1. 1, where it is implied that it was not until after the Thebans had completed the subjugation of their immediate neighbours, which had engaged them both during the year of Cleombrotus' expedition and that of Timotheus' circumnavigation of the Peloponnesus, that they attacked the Phocians—it follows that Cleombrotus' third expedition to help the Phocians falls in 374 and not as Clinton puts it, in the previous year.

Then σχεδὸν περὶ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Polydamas the Pharsalian came to Sparta to ask for aid against Jason of Pheræ.

After narrating this transaction with some detail, Xenophon[1] goes back to the Lacedæmonian expedition in support of the Phocians, and tells how the Athenians—doubtless in the same year—made a separate peace with the Lacedæmonians. Immediately afterwards orders were sent to Timotheus at Corcyra to return to Athens. On his way home he replaced certain Zacynthian exiles in their island. This was regarded by the Spartans as a violation of the new peace; whereupon εὐθύς (§ 3) they collected a fleet of 60 ships and despatched it under the admiral Mnasippus with orders to sail against Corcyra. Unfortunately Xenophon gives no more definite marks of time for this or the next three or four years. Diodorus[2] makes positive mistakes. He speaks of a preliminary expedition (which of course is quite[3] possible) sent out by the Lacedæmonians under Alcidas, which was shortly followed by Mnasippus with his 60 ships. He then goes on to say, that the Athenians tried to counteract this move by sending Ctesicles to Zacynthus[4] and by collecting a fleet, which was put under the command of Timotheus. All these events as well as the defeat and death of Mnasippus he puts in the archonship of Socratides 374/3, by which he means 374; whereas, as will shortly appear, Timotheus set sail in 373.

To return to Xenophon[5]: hard pressed by the ravages of

[1] vi. 2. 1.
[2] xv. 46. 47.
[3] cf. Grote ix. 358.
[4] Probably a mere oversight for Corcyra, as in cap. 47 he speaks of Ctesicles as sent to Corcyra.
[5] vi. 2. 8—11.

Mnasippus, who finally succeeded in blockading their city, the Corcyræans appealed to Athens for help. The Athenians decided *ἰσχυρῶς ἐπιμελητέον εἶναι*, sent Stesicles with 600 peltasts across the mainland, and *ἐψηφίσαντο καὶ ἑξήκοντα ναῦς πληροῦν, Τιμόθεον δ' αὐτῶν στρατηγὸν ἐχειροτόνησαν.* Fortunately the exact date of Timotheus' departure from Athens is preserved in Demosthenes contr. Neær. 1186—*ἐπὶ Σωκρατίδου ἄρχοντος μουνυχιῶνος μηνός*, i.e. April 373. Evidently therefore, as Mnasippus' operations must have taken some considerable time and the Athenian fleet, we are informed, was very slow in its outfit, Mnasippus must have sailed in the autumn of 374, and Stesicles must have set out some time between Oct. 374 and April 373—probably about mid winter.

Stern[1] has conclusively proved that Curtius and other scholars are mistaken in following Diodorus' dates and narrative in preference to that of the contemporary Xenophon, supported as it is by Apollodorus' (Demosthenes) oration against Timotheus. In accordance with the latter it is evident that Iphicrates replaced Timotheus in the early summer of 373 and sailed for Corcyra, after completing by his vigorous measures the outfit of the fleet, some time between midsummer and autumn. The defeat and death of Mnasippus happened before Iphicrates' arrived at Corcyra. Timotheus' trial and acquittal is fixed by the same oration[2] to the month of November 373. Here there is an apparent discrepancy between the oration and Xenophon's narrative. It might appear from the former[3], that both Iphicrates and Callistratus were present at the trial. The language however does not necessitate this interpretation, and the presence of Callistratus at Athens is fully explained by Xenophon[4] himself, who tells us that on Callistratus' representing to his colleague that, if he returned to Athens, he would either send supplies to the fleet or procure peace with Sparta, Iphicrates let him go.

372 B.C. Iphicrates stayed[5] in Corcyra and the neigh-

[1] l.c. pp. 107—113.
[2] p. 1190.
[3] p. 1187.
[4] vi. 3. 3.
[5] vi. 2. 37, 38.

bourhood all through this year, maintaining his armament partly by hiring out his sailors to work in the fields for the Corcyræans, partly by allowing his mercenaries to serve in the pay of friendly states, and partly by ravages in the enemy's country.

371 B.C. The dates of the peace congress in Sparta about June and of the battle of Leuctra, fought according to Plutarch[1] 20 days later, are sufficiently well attested by the evidence collected by Clinton.

Part II. 371 to 362 B.C.

371 B.C. In the few weeks following the battle of Leuctra, which was fought in July 371, must be placed the expedition of Archidamus[2], and the congress at Athens, in which the peace of the previous June was solemnly renewed. Xenophon[3] next relates the restoration of Mantinea, which was effected evidently before and not, as Pausanias[4] says, after the first Theban invasion of the Peloponnesus.

370 B.C. The most important event of this year was the assassination of Jason of Pheræ just at the moment when he was making great preparations to appear at the Pythian games (370 c. August), the mention[5] of which satisfactorily fixes the date. His death freed the Greek world from a great danger, and enabled[6] the Thebans to turn their attention with safety to affairs in the Peloponnesus. There the restoration of Mantinea, the formation of the Arcadian League and the foundation of Megalopolis in the winter of 371/370[7] by the Arcadian democrats had given rise to great internal commotions. The Tegeate oligarchs had appealed to Sparta, and the ephors had despatched Agesilaus to their assistance[8] in the winter 370/369. All these dates are in harmony both with

[1] v. Agesil. 28.
[2] vi. 4. 17, 18. 5. 1.
[3] vi. 5. 4, 5.
[4] ix. 14. 4.
[5] vi. 4. 30.
[6] cf. Stern l.c. pp. 165, 166.
[7] cf. Clinton, F. H. The foundation is not mentioned by Xenophon.
[8] vi. 5. 20. ἦν μέσος χειμών.

Xenophon and Diodorus. The retirement of Agesilaus to Sparta was immediately followed by the first Theban invasion of the Peloponnesus, which according to Diodorus[1] lasted 85 days, and which ended while it was still winter[2], i.e. early in 369.

369 B.C. *τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει*[3] i.e. April 369 (for Xenophon, it must be remembered[4], always reckons the year to begin with the spring) a new alliance was concluded between Athens and Sparta. Then the Thebans made their second invasion of the Peloponnesus. The time of year is perhaps marked by the arrival and departure of the troops, which Dionysius I. of Syracuse sent to the aid of the Spartans: for under the conditions of ancient navigation they could hardly have arrived before May, and according to Diodorus[5] they returned at the end of the summer.

368 B.C. The words *ἡ παρὰ Διονυσίου δευτέρα βοήθεια*[6] fix with tolerable accuracy the next events recorded by Xenophon. For Dionysius I. died in the spring[7] of 367. Their arrival was simultaneous with the congress at Delphi summoned by Philiscus, the envoy of the satrap Ariobarzanes. If Köhler's interpretation be correct, this date is confirmed by the inscription[8] recording the honours voted by the Athenian assembly to Dionysius I. towards the end of the archonship of Lysistratus, 369/8, which in lines 5 ff. seems to refer to this congress at Delphi. The so-called 'Tearless Victory'[9] was gained this year by the Lacedæmonians over the Arcadians and Argives.

368–365 B.C. The chronology of the next three and a half years is most uncertain. It depends very much on the time assigned to the movements of Pelopidas, all of which, with the exception of his embassy to Susa, are unnoticed by Xenophon. Clinton omits them altogether. Grote departs[10],

[1] xv. 67.

[2] vi. 5. 50. *ἔτι καὶ χειμὼν ἦν.*

[3] vii. 1. 1.

[4] Clinton, forgetting this practice, postdates the Second Theban Invasion and the following events.

[5] xv. 70. *τοῦ θέρους λήγοντος.* Cf. Xen. vii. 1. 22.

[6] vii. 1. 28.

[7] cf. Clinton.

[8] CIA. ii. 51.

[9] vii. 1. 32. Diod. xv. 72.

[10] cf. Stern l.c. p. 201.

without sufficient justification, from the ancient authorities and rearranges them on purely *à priori* principles.

Taking the events as they stand in Diodorus[1] and Plutarch[2], we may accept the date assigned by the former for the arrest of Pelopidas and Ismenias by Alexander of Pheræ, and for the unsuccessful expedition of the two Bœotarchs, Cleomenes and Hypates to rescue them—viz. 368. Whether Epaminondas' expedition for the same purpose is to be put in the later months of 368 or in the early months of 367, is a doubtful question. Stern[3] prefers the later date on the ground that Diodorus and Plutarch represent Epaminondas as once more elected Bœotarch and that the elections to that office usually were held about the time of the winter solstice—an argument at this point without much weight, as the two unsuccessful Bœotarchs were evidently deprived of their office and Epaminondas put in their place.

367 B.C. Assuming the early months of this year to be the correct date for Epaminondas' expedition, we must suppose that immediately on his return to Thebes Pelopidas was sent as envoy to the Persian court. Not less than 5 or 6 months must be allowed for the journey up to and down from Susa, and another month or more for the subsequent congress at Thebes and for the despatch of the Theban envoys after its failure to the various Greek States. This brings us at earliest to the autumn of 367; and it is natural to suppose that not until all these negotiations were over did Epaminondas[4] lead his expedition against the Achæans—perhaps in November or December of this same year. This kind of dead reckoning is at this point our only resource, because Diodorus, though he mentions Epaminondas' expedition and puts it, as we assume, correctly under the archonship of Polyzelus 367/6, omits altogether the embassy of Pelopidas to the Persian Court, which must necessarily have occupied a long time, except for a brief allusion[5] in speaking of the exploits of the hero after narrating his death at Cynoscephalæ.

[1] xv. 71.
[2] v. Pelop. 27.
[3] l.c. 196.
[4] vii. 1. 41.
[5] xv. 81.

366 B.C. One of the indirect results of Epaminondas' expedition into Achæa was the political revolution at Sicyon, which finally resulted in Euphron's seizing the tyranny—probably at the very beginning of 366.

In the next two chapters (2, 3) Xenophon records a number of simultaneous events more or less centring round the person of Euphron and the little town of Phlius. Euphron[1] joined the Theban harmost of Sicyon in an attack upon Phlius. The Athenian Chares was sent to assist the Phliasians, and after various operations the Phliasians began to build a fortress at Thyamia. At this point Xenophon introduces a digression, describing the further career and assassination of Euphron. From vii. 4. 1 it appears that this happened before the departure of Chares from Phlius and therefore, notwithstanding Grote's[2] remark that a year is too short for Euphron's career, his death must be assigned to this same year. Then the historian[3] returns from his digression to the Phliasians fortifying Thyamia *τοῦ Χάρητος ἔτι παρόντος*, when Oropus, at the time in the occupation of the Athenians, was seized by some exiles. The Athenians summoned Chares to help them to recover the town, but they were obliged to content themselves with leaving it in the hands of the Thebans, until the question of their claims should be settled by arbitration. With the departure[4] of Chares and the Athenian troops the Sicyonians were free to recapture their harbour, which Euphron just before his death had seized with the help of some Athenian mercenaries and handed over to the Lacedæmonians.

This date for the capture of Oropus agrees with Diodorus[5], who puts it under the archonship of Cephisodorus 366 5. Immediately afterwards, it would appear from the sequence in Xenophon's[6] narrative, the Corinthians, Phliasians, and Epidaurians, weary of the long wars, with the consent of Sparta made a separate peace with Thebes. This must be the peace which Diodorus[7] wrongly represents as a universal peace made

[1] vii. 2. 11—23.
[2] x. 26.
[3] vii. 4. 1.
[4] cp. vii. 4. 1 with vii. 3. 4 and vii. 3. 2.
[5] xv. 76.
[6] vii. 4. 6—11.
[7] xv. 76.

through the intervention of the Persian king. His date for it however is to be accepted, viz. the archonship of Cephisodorus 366/5, which is further confirmed by his remark—*πόλεμος κατελύθη πλεῖον μείνας ἐτῶν πέντε, τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν Λευκτρικῶν*, Leuctra having been fought in 371.

In this year too arrived[1] the third reinforcements from Syracuse for the Spartans sent this time by Dionysius II., his father having died, as already mentioned, in the spring of the previous year.

365 B.C. The chronology of this and the next year presents but little difficulty. We may take Xenophon's[2] words *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον* as marking somewhere near the beginning of 365, when war broke out between the Eleians and Arcadians. To this year we may certainly assign all the events recorded in §§ 12—18; and though it is tempting to suppose that the words in § 19 *οἱ δ' αὖ Ἀρκάδες πάλιν ποιοῦνται ἄλλην στρατείαν εἰς τὴν Ἦλιν*, it seems better to follow the chronology of Diodorus[3] and to put this second campaign together with the capture of Cromnus by Archidamus the Spartan king under this same year 365. At the latest these events can hardly be placed later than January to March 364; for Xenophon ought to mean by the words *ἐπιόντος Ὀλυμπιακοῦ ἔτους*[4] about April 364.

364 B.C. The Arcadians in the spring[5] began to make great preparations for their celebration of the Olympic festival, which would take place in July.

This was the year of the death of Pelopidas at Cynoscephalæ, which is fixed with something like certainty by the mention of an eclipse in Diodorus[6] and Plutarch[7]. This must be the eclipse of July 13, 364.

364 July–362 July. The remaining sections of the Hellenica are occupied with the commotions in Arcadia, which arose from a dispute over the use of the sacred treasures of Olympia, and which culminated in the intervention of the

[1] vii. 4. 12.
[2] vii. 4. 12.
[3] xv. 77.
[4] vii. 4. 28.
[5] vii. 4. 28.
[6] xv. 80.
[7] v. Pelop. 32.

Thebans and the battle of Mantinea in 362. Xenophon gives absolutely no marks of time, so that it is impossible to distribute the events, which he records, over this interval with any semblance of probability; and no help whatever can be gained from the confused narrative of Diodorus[1].

The first event[2] to which a date can be given is the treaty of the Arcadians, Achæans, Eleians, and other Peloponnesian states with the Athenians, which is actually extant in an inscription[3], dated the archonship of Molon i.e. 362/1, who entered upon office about July 22. The battle of Mantinea occurred shortly after the conclusion of this treaty[4] *σίτου συγκομιδῆς οὔσης*, probably at the beginning of August. Diodorus[5] and Plutarch[6] therefore must both be mistaken in putting the battle under the archonship of Chariclides, 363/2, the latter even giving the exact date, or rather that of the annual festival, which was held to commemorate the victory, as the 12th of Scirophorion i.e. about 3 July. Diogenes[7] Laertius repeats the mistake. The date of the festival seems somehow to have been different from the day of the battle, how or why—cannot be explained. But the evidence of the inscription, backed up as it is by Xenophon's *σίτου συγκομιδή* must be taken to outweigh this strange unanimity on the part of three authorities, each one of whom would by himself be of but little importance.

[1] xv. 82.
[2] vii. 5. 1—3.
[3] CIA. ii. 57 b.
[4] vii. 5. 14.
[5] xv. 82.
[6] de glor. Ath. 850 a.
[7] ii. 54.

G. E. UNDERHILL.

TWO NEW MSS. IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. Homer, *Odyssey* III. 283—497.

Papyri of the Iliad are the commonest form of literary discovery among the documents disinterred in Egypt of late years; but the relatively inferior popularity of the Odyssey in antiquity is reflected by the comparative rarity of papyri containing any part of it. One only is mentioned by Ludwich, namely the Berlin papyrus 154[a], containing about 70 lines of book xiv. No other has yet been announced as being in the possession of either Paris, Berlin, or Vienna, though it is highly probable that there may be some hitherto unpublished fragments in the collection of the Archduke Rainer. Prof. Nicole of Geneva possesses some fragments of the Odyssey, but the extent and character of them have not yet been made public. Meanwhile the British Museum has acquired within the last year some portions of a very fine manuscript (now Brit. Mus. Pap. cclxxi.), containing the conclusion of the third book, accompanied by a few scholia; and the manuscript is of a class good enough to warrant, and indeed (considering its age) to require, the publication of its text in full.

Unlike most of the papyri hitherto discovered, this ms. may well have been written for sale or for a public library. It is written on light-coloured papyrus of good quality, 13 inches in height, in columns occupying $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches in width, with margins of about $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches at the top, $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches at the bottom, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches between the columns. The writing is a large, delicate

uncial, perhaps the finest specimen of that class of hand on papyrus at present known to exist. The columns contain from 34 to 36 lines each, at which rate the whole book would have occupied a roll of about eight feet in length. There are a few accents, breathings, and marks of elision, etc., all by the original scribe; in two cases he has prefixed breathings to the second part of a compound word (*Λαέρκεα* in l 425 and *εὐρυόδείης* in l. 453). Punctuation marks are added at the ends of lines, and occasionally in the middle (ll. 320, 323, 460, 471, 477, 484, 485, 490, 496). These have in some cases, possibly in all, been added subsequently to the original text. The original scribe has also prefixed an arrowhead-shaped mark to certain lines, which seems to represent an *obelus*. The lines to which it is attached are ll. 321 (presumably carrying with it 322), 396 (omitted in one MS., G), 400 (which involves 401, both of these lines being athetised by Zenodotus), 458, 461, 472, 484 (involving 485), and 486. The scholia are written in the margins between and above the columns, in a small cursive hand, to which are also due the corrections in ll. 469, 483, 490, 492. The presence of this hand is of great value in helping to assign a date to the MS., as it regularly uses the peculiar form of *η* which is found (speaking roughly) only between the middle of the 1st century and the middle of the 2nd. A superior limit for the scholia is given by the occurrence in them of the name of the grammarian Apion, who flourished (and was already famous) in the time of Caligula. It is impossible to say how long after the transcription of the original MS. the addition of the scholia took place; but it is evident that the original MS. cannot safely be dated lower than the first century of our era, and palaeographical considerations would not justify its being placed much earlier. To that century, therefore, it may be provisionally assigned, and it is unquestionably a valuable and handsome specimen of early uncial writing.

The following is the text of the portions of the MS. which have been preserved. Dots placed beneath letters indicate that those letters are only partially legible. All other marks, whether of punctuation, accentuation, or elision, are reproduced from the MS.

col. 1] . . . . . ιεν αελλαι
284 . . . . . γομενος περ οδοιο
285 . . . . . πι κτερεα κτερισειεν·
. . . . . ν επι οινοπα ποντον
. . . . . μαλειάων ορος αιπυ
. . . . . γερην οδον ευρυοπα ζευς
. . . . . νεμων επ αὐτμένα χευε·
290 . . . . . ντο πελωρια ισα ορεσσιν·
. . . . . μεν κρητηι επελασσεν
. . . . . ιαρ . . νου αμφι ρε . θρα
293 . . . . . ια . . . . . .

desunt vv. 294–318, ad finem columnae.

col. 2] εκ των ανθρωπων οθεν . . . . . .
320 ελθεμεν· οντινα πρωτον . . . . . .
εις πελαγος μεγα τοῖον ὀθε . . . . . .
αυτόετες οιχνεῦσιν επει . . . . . .
αλλ ιθι· νυ . συν νηϊ τε ση . . . . . .
ει δ' εθελ . . ς πεζος πάρ . . . . . .
325 παρ δ . τοι . . ες εμοι οι τ . . . . . .
. . . . . ονα διαν οθ . . . . . .
327 . . . . . ε μιν αυτ . . . . . .

desunt vv. 328–386.

col. 3] υιασι και γαμβροισιν εα προς δω . . . . καλα·
388 αλλ ότε δωμαθ ι . . ντο αγακλυτ . . . . . ανακτος
εξε . . . . . κλισ . . . . . νου . . .
390 τοις δ ο γερ . . . . . ακε . . . . . .

οινου ηδυπότο . . . . . νδεκατ . . . νιαυ . . .

ωϊξεν ταμιη . αι . . . . . ηδεμν . . . . . .

του ο γερων κρητη . . . . . σσατο πολ . . . . . .

ευχετ αποσπενδω . . . . . ηι διος αι . . . . . .

395 αυταρ επει σπεισ . . . . . σον ηθ . . . . . .

> οι μεν κακκε . . . . . ονδε εκα . . . . .

του δ αὐτοῦ κο . . . . . ι' . . . . .

τηλεμαχον φι . . . . . .

τρητοις ευ λ . . . . . .

400 > παρ δ αρ εὖ . . . . . .

ὁς δι ετ η . θε . . . . . .

. . τος δ αυτ . . . . . .

ωι δ αλοχος δε . . . . . .

404 . . ος δ . . . . . .

desunt vv. 405–421.

col. 4] . . . . . δε βοω . . πιβουκολος ανηρ·

423 . . . . . αχου μεγ . θυ . ου . . . μελαιναν

. . . . . ταρους αγέτω λιπετω δε δύ όιους·

425 . . . . . σοχόον λαὲρκε . δε . . ο κελεσθω

. . . . . όφρ . βοος χρυ . . ν . . . ασιν πὲριχευη·

. . . . . εν . . . . . τε δ εισω

. . . . . α πενεσθαι

. . . . . ν υδωρ

430 . . . . . θε μ . . αρ βους

. . . . . ση.

. . . . . ε χα . . ευς

desunt vv. 433, 434, sed spatium iis idoneum in margine indicatur.

435 . . . . . η
. . . . . στωρ
. . . . . πὲρίχευεν
. . . . . .
. . . . . χ . . ρων
440 . . . . . τι λεβητι
. . . . . χεν ουλας
. . . . . μος θρασυμηδης
. . . . . ικοψων·
. . . . . τα νεστωρ
445 . . . . . ετο πολλα δ αθηνηι
. . . . . τριχας εν πυρι β . . λων·
. . . . . υτας προβαλοντο
. . . . . ος θρασυμηδης
. . . . . οψε τενοντας
450 . . . . . αι δ ολολυξαν
. . . . . ακοιτις
. . . . . ιο θυγατρων
. . . . . υρυδδειης
. . . . . ορχαμος ανδρω .
455 . . . . . ε δ οστεα θυμος
. . . . . εκ μ . ρία ταμνον
col. 5] παντα κ . . . . . υψαν
> διπτυχα πο . . . . . ωμοθετησα .
καιε δ επι σχ . . . . . ο γερων ε . . . . ιθοπα οινον
460 λειβε· νεοι δε παρ αυτον εχον πεμπωβολα χερσι
> αυταρ επει κατα μῆρ εκαη και σπλαγχν επασαντο

. . . . . λλον τ ara ταλλα και αμφ οβελοισιν επ . . . . .

. . . ων δ ακροπορους οβελους εν χερσι . . . . . .

. . . . . δε τηλεμαχον λουσεν καλη πολυ . . . . .

. . . . οpος οπλοτατη θυγατηρ νηληιαδα.

. . . . ρ επει λουσεν τε και εχρισεν λιπ ελ . . . .

. . φι δε μιν φαρος καλον βαλεν ηδε χιτων.

. . ρ ασαμινθου βη δεμας αθανατοισιν ομοιος

. ar δ ογε νεστορ' ιων κατ ar εζετο ποιμενα . . . .

οι δ επει ωπτησαν κρε υπερτερα και ερυσαντ.

δαινυνθ εζομενοι· επι δ ανερες εσθλοι ὄροντο

οινον ενοινοχοευντες ενι χρυσεοις δεπαεσσιν·

αυταρ επει ποσιος και εδητυος εξ ερον εντο

τοισι δε μυθων ηρχε γερηνιος ιπποτα νεστωρ·

παιδες εμοι αγε τηλεμαχωι καλλιτριχας ιππους

ζευξαθ' υφ armat αγοντες ινα πρησσησιν οδοιο·

ως εφαθ· οι δ ara του μαλα μεν κλυον ηδ επιθοντο·

καρπαλιμως δ έζευξαν υφ αρμασιν ωκεας ιππους·

αν δε γυνη ταμιη σιτον και οινον εθηκεν

ὀψά τε οια εδουσι διοτρεφεες βασιληες·

αν δ ara τηλεμαχος πὲρικαλλεα βησετο διφρον

παρ δ ara νεστοριδης πεισιστρατος ορχαμος ανδρων·

ες διφρον δ' ανεβαινε και ἡνια λαζετο χερσιν·

μαστιξεν δ ελααν· τω δ ουκ ακουτε πετεσθην

ες πεδιον· λιπετην δε πυλου αιπυ πτολιεθρον·

οι . . πανημεριοι σειον ζυγον αμφις εχοντες

ε . φὴρὰς δ ικοντο διοκληος ποτι δωμα

. . . ος ορτιλοχοιο τον αλφειος τεκε παιδα·

ε . θα δε νύκτ ἰεσαν· ο δε ~~τοις παρ~~ ara ξεινια η θηκεν ow (sic)

ημος δ ηριγενεια φανη ροδοδακτυλος ηως

492 ιππους τε ζευγνυντ ανά θ άρματα ποικιλα βαινον· (*sic*)

col. 6] . . . . . ξεν δ ελααν . ω . . . . . τε πετεσθην·

495 . . . ν δ ες πεδιον πυρη . . . . . δ επειτα

. . ον ὁδόν· τοιον γαρ υπεκφερ . . . κεες ιπποι·

497 . . σετο τ ηελιος σκιοωντο τε π . . . . . γυιαι

— —
ΟΔΥCC . . . C
— —

— —
A E
— —

Collated with Ludwich's text (Leipzig, 1889), the papyrus shows the following variants:

286 *καὶ κεῖνος* Ludwich, with DU; *κἄκεῖνος* schol. (Herodorus) in Pap., with several MSS.

290 *τροφόεντα* Ludwich, with FPT etc.; *τροφέοντο* Pap., with Aristarchus and many MSS., also Apion and Herodorus, according to the scholium (vid. infr.).

443 *χειρί* Ludwich with Aristarchus' MSS. and others; *χερσί* schol. (Herodorus) in Pap., with Eustathius and D.

460 *χερσίν*: *χερσί* Pap.

461 *σπλάγχνα πάσαντο* Ludwich, with Aristarchus; *σπλάγχν' ἐπάσαντο* Pap., with MSS.

469 *ποιμένα* Pap. (Ludwich and several MSS.), corrected to *ποιμένι* (GDSK etc.).

472 *οἰνοχοεῦντες* Ludwich, with most MSS.: *ἐνοινοχοεῦντες* Pap., with FT and scholiasts.

476 *πρήσσῃσιν*: *πρήσσησιν* Pap., with D.

479 *ἐν* Ludwich, with MSS.: *ἄν* Pap., with TH².

483 δ' Pap., corrected to *τ'* (Ludwich, MSS.). *χερσί* Ludwich, with MSS.: *χερσίν* Pap., with K.

487 is omitted.

490 ὁ δ' ἄρα *ξεινήια δῶκεν* Ludwich, with most MSS., Pap. corr.; ὁ δὲ *τοῖς πὰρ ξείνια θῆκεν* Pap., with PJKH²M².
492 *ποικίλ' ἔβαινον* Ludwich, Pap. corr.; *ποικίλα βαΐνον* Pap.
493 is omitted, with Ludwich and most MSS.

It will be seen that the variants are not very numerous nor specially important; but they are all genuine variants, not mere errors of the scribe, and as such they deserve attention. The MS. indeed was evidently written with great care, and consequently its age gives it importance.

It remains to describe the scholia; and since these are often mutilated and sometimes obscure, they will be transcribed as they stand, without punctuation or expansion of contracted syllables. The only omissions are a few instances in which the mutilation of the papyrus has left only one or two letters of a scholium.

284 *κατεσχετ επειγομ απιω λοχ και ενατ*

286 *κακεινος ερω*

290 . . . . *τε τροφεοντο ερω και απιω*

391 *οινου ηδυ τ' ψιλως ἐν δε[κατω] αφ ου γαρ ανεστρε[ψα]ν εξ ιλιου και οδυσσευς συν αυτοις δεκατον ετος εστ[ι] τω . . ηδυν . ταστων ε . . τορι εν δεκα ετ[ε]σιν . .* (written at top of column).

427 *εξω μ[εν οι α]λλοι με ερω ειπετε ως απο τη δρα . μων μετοχης δρα . . . . . ει ον απο της . . λλε . . . ειπετε και ον χρηται ομη διο ον γραπτεον* (written at top of column).

ib. *οτι τ' ουκ . . . .*

430 *εν ηρ . . . .*

431 . . *το νηος διχ*

437 *εδωκε δ επειτα*

438 [ο]*τι αγαλμα το ιερειον αμ*

443 *ερω εν χερσι*

444 το του αιματος αγγει^{o} ερ^{ω} τ′ αμνι^{o} οτι ᾱ ωνομασθη

452 . . [υπ]ερθετικου του πρεσβιστ^{η}

456 δι . . . . . μὴρί εταμνον

468 ζ^{η} το . . . . . ν γαρ εφαινετο . . . . . .

. . . . . ειν εκ της μακρας

478 $^{β′}$οινον και $^{α′}$σιτ[ον] εθηκε α^{μ}

483 ο^{υ} χερσιν α^{μ} ερ^{ω} δ ανεβαινε και εξ^{ω} το ανεβαινε

486 ο^{τ} πανη^{μ} και το λοι^{ὸ} της ημερας α^{μ}

490 κε α^{μ} ο δε τοις παρ ξεινια θηκεν εν τ^{ι}

These scholia need interpretation at the hands of some one experienced in this class of literature. The commentators principally mentioned are (1) $α^{μ}$ = Ammonius, who wrote in the 1st century B.C. (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* v. 712); (2) $απι^{ω}$ = Apion, a disciple of Didymus, who flourished under Tiberius and Caligula (*ib.* i. 503); (3) $ερ^{ω}$, who is not so easily identifiable at first sight. The only author to whom this abbreviation would properly correspond is Erotianus, who is known only as a commentator on Hippocrates in the first century after Christ. The name Ἐρωτίανος is sometimes found in the form Ἡροδιανός (Fabricius, vi. 234); but the well-known Homeric commentator of the latter name flourished too late (*temp.* Marcus Aurelius) for his works to be cited in a MS. of this date. This varying form of the name, however, supports the suggestion (for which I am indebted to the Provost of Oriel) that the writer intended is Herodorus, who is frequently quoted by Eustathius in company with Apion (Fabr. i. 515, Lehrs *De Aristarchi studiis*, pp. 370—375); (4) $ζ^{η}$ = Zenodotus, but there is nothing to show which of the writers of that name is intended. Who are the authors mentioned with Apion in the note on l. 284 I do not know, nor are the readings of the letters in that passage certain. τ′ (schol. on ll. 391, 427, 444) presumably stands for τινές.

2. DEMOSTHENES *De Falsa Legatione*, §§ 11—32.

The early manuscripts of classical authors which have been discovered within recent years have all been inscribed on papyrus; and some special interest may therefore attach to some fragments of a vellum MS. which appears to be considerably older than any other extant specimen of that material, and to rank in age with some of the papyri just alluded to. Moreover, though it is not the oldest extant MS. of Demosthenes, being some centuries later than the papyrus containing the Third Epistle (Brit. Mus. Pap. cxxxiii.), it is the oldest MS. of any of his orations, containing as it does a portion of the *De Falsa Legatione*. It therefore seems to require a fuller description than can be given in the official Catalogue of Additions to the Department of MSS. in the British Museum, in which it figures as Add. MS. 34473.

The fragments now in possession of the British Museum, which were acquired with a number of papyri discovered, or stated to be discovered, in the Fayyúm, consist of four pages, forming the two inside leaves of a quaternion. This quaternion was the first in the entire MS., and its first page held the beginning of the oration. Each page measured 7½ inches by 6½, and contained two columns of small writing, with 36 lines to each column. No column is preserved intact, but the four interior columns are nearly complete, while the four which stood nearer the outside edges of the leaves have suffered more severely. The fourth page bears the number ϛ (= 6) in its upper margin. The writing is a small, neat uncial, slightly uneven in respect of the size of the letters, *o* in particular being consistently small. *Paragraphi* have been inserted by the original scribe in the way familiar in early MSS., below the first letters of the line in which a sentence ends; he has also added a certain number of punctuation marks in the text itself, and a few accents and breathings. A few corrections are made, also in the first hand. There is no sign of the MS. having been touched by any but the original scribe. With regard to the date of the MS. it is impossible to be very positive. The hand

is unlike that of any known vellum MS., and must be classed rather with those of the papyri. Regarded from this point of view it is plainly of the Roman period, and both in the size and shape of letters and in the general appearance of the writing it bears considerable resemblance to the papyrus of Herodas (Brit. Mus. Pap. cxxxv.). (I may say in passing that, in view of the greater quantity of palaeographical evidence now available for the first three centuries of our era, I should now place the Herodas papyrus in the 1st or 2nd century rather than in the 2nd or 3rd.) No doubt future discoveries will enable us to date literary MSS. of this period with more certainty; meanwhile this Demosthenes MS. may be placed with fair confidence about the 2nd century after Christ. The writing and spelling are careful and the text good, so that it was probably a copy intended for commercial circulation; and it may rank (as some early papyrus MSS. cannot rank) as a link in the tradition of the true text.

Hence its evidence is of some importance as bearing on the fidelity with which the text of Demosthenes (and collaterally of other classical authors) has been handed down; and owing to the mutilated state of the pages a simple collation will not suffice to show its character, since it would leave a doubt as to where its testimony is available and where it is imperfect. It is therefore necessary to print the text in full. I have divided the words and used capital initials for proper names; but all accents, breathings, and punctuation marks are as in the MS. Dots beneath letters signify that they are only partially preserved.

pag. 1, col. 1

§ 11 τον υπερ Φιλιππου λεγον[. . .]
περ ὕμων εφη δεδημηγορη[. . . . .]
και διεξιων ἡλικα την Ελλαδα πα
σαν ουχι τας ιδιας αδικουσι μονον
πατριδας οι δωροδοκουντες και
χρηματα λαμβανοντες παρα Φι

§ 12 λιππου· επειδη τοινυν ταυτα πολι
τευομενου τουτου τοτε και τουτο
το δειγμα εξενηνοχοτος περι αυτου
τους περι της ειρηνης πρεσβεις
ως Φιλιππον πεμπειν επίσθητε
υπο Αριστοδημου και Νεοπτόλεμου
και Κτησιφωντος και των αλλων
των εκειθεν απαγγελλοντων
ουδ' οτιουν υγιες. γιγνεται των
πρεσβεων τουτων εἰς και ουτος
ουχ ως των αποδωσομενων τα
ὕμετερα ουδ' ως των πεπιστευ
κοτων τωι Φιλιππωι· αλλ' ὡς των
φυλαξοντων τους αλλους· δια γαρ
τους προειρημενους λογους και
την προς Φιλιππον απέχθειαν
εικοτως ταυτην περι αυτου παν

§ 13 τες ειχετε την δοξαν· [. . . .]
ελθων τοινυν εμοι μετα τ[. . . .]
συνεταττε[. . .]οινηι πρεσ[. . . . .]
και οπως τον[. . . . .]ν κ[. . . . .]
φυλαξομεν αμ[. . . . .]
κρατην πολλα παρ[. . . . .]
και μεχρι του δευρο ε[. . . . .]
απο της πρωτης πρεσβ[. . . .]
εμε γουν ὠ [. . .]φ[. .]ρ[.]εν[. . . . .]
πεπρακως ἀυτ[. . . . .]
χωρις γαρ των αλ[. . . . .]

κει προτερον· ανα[. . . . .]

ραι των εκκλησιω[. . . . .]

col. 2 [. . . . .]

αρ[. . . . .]

οι[. . . . .]

πεν[. . . . .]νευσειν

§ 14 ει[. . . . .]φη χρονον εσκ[.]

[. . . . .]ατης ω πως αν αριστα ε

[. . . . .] τηι ειρηνηι ουκ[. .]

[. . . . .]νον ευρειν οιμ[. . . . .]

αυ[. . . . .] εγω δ[. . . . .]

μ[. . . . .]αν εις Α[. . . . .]

ων[. . . . .]ται ουδεποτ' αν συν[. . .]

λε[. . . . .]ησασθαι τη[. . . . .]

ε[. . . . .] φημι δειν[. . . . .]

[. . . . .]υς τινας βραχ[. . . . .]

§ 15 [. . . . .]ογους [. . . . .]

cetera desunt.

col. 3 (pag. 2) . . . . .

. . . . .

[. . . . .] με[. . . . .]υ

[. . .] πεισθεντες [. . . . .]κως

§ 17 [. .]τον ην· ον μεν ουν τρ[. . . .]ω

[. .]ιροτονησαντων υμων[. . . . .]υς

[. . . . .]ς αυτον παλιν του[. . . . .]

[. . . . .]τα πραγ[. . . . .]

[. . . . .] της πολε[. . . . .]

[. . . . .]ουτων[.]μοι προς [. . . . .]έ
[. . . . .]ι συνεβησαν βουλο[. . . .]ι
[. . . . .]ν [.]υτικα ακουσ[. . . . .]λ' ε
[. . . . .]ιν ηκομεν[. . . . .]ε
[. . . . .]υτης της επι[. . . . .]
[. . . . .] ά[.]ν [. . . . .]

cetera desunt.

col. 4 [. . . .]σθαι συνεβουλευον μηδε
ταυτα παθειν· μηδ' αναρτωμενους
ελπισιν εξ ελπιδων και ὑποσχε
σεσιν εις τουσχατον ελθειν τα
πραγματα εασαι· και επεισα ταυτα
§ 19 την βουλην· επειδη δε ἡκεν ἡ εκ
κλησια και προς ὑμας εδει λεγειν
παρελθων Αισχινης ουτοσι πρωτος
ημων απαντων· και προς Διος και
θεων πειρᾶσθε συνδιαμνημο
νευειν εαν ταληθη λεγω τα γαρ
παντα τα πραγματα λυμηναμενα
ὑμων και διαφθειραντα ολως ταυτ'
εστιν ηδη· του μεν απαγγελλειν
τι των πεπρεσβευμενων· η περι
των εν τηι βουληι ρηθεντων· ει αρα
ημφεσβητει μη αληθη λεγειν ε
με μνησθηναι παμπληθες α
πεσχεν· ειπε δε τοιουτους λογους
και τηλικαυτα και τοιαυτα εχοντας

αγαθα ως τ) απαντας ὑμας λαβων

§ 20 ωιχετο· εφη γαρ ηκειν πεπεικως

Φιλιππον πανθ' οσα συμφερει τηι

[. . . . .] και περι των εν Αμφικτυοσι

[. . . . .]ρι των αλλων απαντων· και

[. . .]ξηλθε λογον μακρον υμιν

[. . . . .]βαι[. . . . .]ειν υπερ Φω

[. . . . .]πον εφη· και τα

[. . . . .] προς υμας

[. . . . .]ιζετο εκ των εαυτωι

[. . . . .]βευμενων δυοῖν η τριων

[. . . . .]ν ὐ[. . . . .]οντας οικοι· και

[. . . . .]τε[. . . . .]ς ουδ' ενοχλου

[. . . . .]μεν πολιορκουμε

[. . . . .]υτας χωρις της αλ

§ 21 [. . . . .]κουσεσθαι· Θεσπιᾶς

col. 5 (pag. 3)

δε και Πλαταιᾶς οικιζομε[.]ας [.]ωι

sic θεω' δε τα χρηματα εισπραττομενα

ου παρα Φωκεων αλλα παρα Θηβαιῶ

των βουλευσαντων την καταληψιν

του ἱερου· διδαξαι γαρ αυτος εφηι τον

Φιλιππον οτι ουδεν ηττον ησεβη

κασιν οι βεβουλευκοτες των ταις

χερσι πραξαντων· και δια τουτο

χρηματ' αυτωι τους Θεβαιους επι

§ 22 κεκηρυχεναι· ακουειν δε και των

Ευβοεων ενιων εφη πεφοβημε

νων και τεταραγμενων την προς
την πολιν οικειοτητα Φιλιππωι >
γεγενημενην· ~~και λεγειν~~ οτι ου
λελησθατε ημας ω ανδρες πρεσβεις
εφ οις πεποίησθε προς Φιλιππον
την ειρηνην· ουδ' αγνοουμεν οτι
υμεις μεν Αμφιπολιν δεδωκατε
εκεινωι·
Φιλιππωι Φιλιππος δε ὕμιν· ωμολο
γησεν Ευβοιαν παραδωσειν· ειναι
δέ τι και αλλο διωικημενον αυτωι·
ου μην πω τουτο γε βουλεσθαι [. . . . .]
και γαρ νυν φθονειν τι[. . . . .]
των συν πρεσβε[. . . . .]
πω
ουτω και παρεδηλο[. . . . .]
§ 23 ευδοκιμων δε επι[. . . . .]
και δοκων ρητω[. . . . .]
ανηρ θαυμαστος [. . . . .]
σεμνως· αναστα[. . . . .]
ουκ εφην ειδεναι· [. . . . .]
τι λεγειν τουτων ὡν [. . . . .]
απηγγειλα· και παραστ[. . . . .]
ένθεν ο δ' ενθεν ουτ[. . . . .]
κρατης. εβοων εξε[. . . . .]
λευτωντες εχλευα[. . . . .]
εγελατε· και ουτε ακ[. . . . .]
col. 6 ου[. . . . . .]ν ηβουλεσθε άλλα
§ 24 πλη[. . .]υτος απηγγελκει· και νη
τους θεους εικος τι παθειν εμοιγ' ε

δοκειτε· τις γαρ αν ηνεσχετο τηλι
καυτα και τοιαυτα εσεσθαι προσδο
κῶν ἀγαθα· sic η ταυθ' ως ουκ εσται λε
γοντος τινος η κατηγορουντος των
πεπραγμενων τουτοις · παντα γαρ
ταλλ' οιμαι τοτε δευτερα ην των
ὑποκειμενων προσδοκιῶν και
των ελπιδων· οἱ δ' αντιλεγοντες
οχλος αλλως και βα[.]καvια κατε
φ[. . . .]το· ταυτα δε θαυμασια η[.]ικα
και σ[. .]φεροντα εδοκ[ει . . . . .]χθαι
τηι πο[. . . . . .]

§ 25 μνη
το
μ

cetera desunt.

§ 27

col. 7 (pag. 4) ταυτα διεξηλθον [. . . . . .] τινος
και ουδενος ελαττονος [. . . . . .]. ινα
την ὁτ' αδωροκητος ὑπηρχεν
προαιρεσιν αυτου της πολιτειας
αναμνησθεντες ως προβεβλη
μενη και απιστος ἡν προς τον Φι
λιππον· την μετα ταυτα εξαιφνης
γεγονυιαν πιστιν και φιλιαν σκε
§ 28 ψησθε· ειτ' ει μεν εκβεβηκεν οσα
απηγγειλε προς ὑμας ουτος και κα
λως εχει τα πεπραγμενα δια την

αληθειαν κ[. .] το συμφερον τηι π[. . . .]
γεγ[.]νησ[. .]ι νομισητε· ει δε [. . . . .]
τ[. . . . .] ὡν ουτος ει[. . .] πεπ
[. . . . .]νην
[. . . . .]τ᾽ εχει

cetera desunt.

col. 8

§ 30 [. . . . .] ου γαρ ει φαυλοις χρῆσθε
ὑμεις εις τα κοινα πολλακις αν
θρωποισι και τα πραγματα εστι
φαυλα ὡν η πολις αξιουται παρα τοις
αλλοις· ουδε πολλου δει· ειτα Φωκε
[. .] απολώλεκε μεν οιμαι Φιλιππος
[.]υνηγωνισαντο δε ουτοι τουτο
δε δη δει σκοπειν και ορᾶν ει ὁσα
της των Φωκεων σωτηριας επι
την πρεσβειαν ηκεν· ταυτα παντα
απωλεσαν ουτοι και διεφθειραν
ἑκοντες ουχ ως [. . .] Φωκεας απω
§ 31 λεσε το καθ ἁυτον ποθεν δος δε
μοι το προβουλευμα ὁ προς την
εμην απεγγελιαν εψηφισατο η
βουλη· και την μαρτυριαν την του
γραψαντος αυτο τοτε· ινα γνωτε
οτι εγω μεν ου τοτε σιγησας νυν
αφισταμαι των πεπραγμενων·
αλλ᾽ ευθυς κατηγορουν και προε
ωρων τα μελλοντα· η βουλη δε

[. . .] κωλύθεισα ακουειν παρ εμου

[. . . . . .] τ᾽ επηινησεν τουτους

[. . . . . .]ειον ηξιωσεν

[. . . . . .] τουτ᾽ αφ ου γεγονεν

[. . . . . .] πωποτε φησιν

[. . . . . .] πρεσβεις· ουδε

[. . . . . .]ατον κατεχειρο

[. . . . . .]ς· ἀλλ᾽ ουτοι πεπον

§ 32 [. . . . . .] τοις πρωτον μεν

[. . . . . .]ιαν· ειτα το προβουλευμα

— — — —

[. .]ρτυρια προβευλευμα

— — — —

[. . . . . .]παινος ουτε κλησις

[. . . . .]ειον εστιν των πρε

[. . . . . .]ς βουλης· ει δε φησιν

Collated with Blass' text (Teubner Library edition, 1885), the new codex (which, having been acquired from the well-known Viennese dealer, Herr Graf, will be referred to as G) shows the following variants.

§ 11 *ἀδικοῦσι* G: *ἀδικοῦσιν* B.

§ 12 *δεῖγμα* G: *δεῖγμ᾽* B; and similarly throughout.
ὡς Φίλιππον πέμπειν G: *πέμπειν ὡς Φίλιππον* B.
ἐπίσθητε G: *ἐπείσθητε* B.
τούτων εἰς καί, bracketed by B after Vind., is retained by G.
εἰκότως ταύτην G: *ταύτην εἰκότως* B.

§ 13 *αὐτόν* G: *ἑαυτόν* B.
ὧν προειρήκει G probably, with Q marg.: *ὧν ὅπερ εἶπον εἰρήκει* B.
εἶπεν οὗτος G probably: *οὗτος εἶπεν* B.

§ 14 *βραχεῖς* [*εἶπε*] G: *εἶπε βραχεῖς* B.

§ 19 *ἐὰν τἀληθῆ* G: *ἂν ἀληθῆ* B.
ἀληθῆ G, with SLOY: *τἀληθῆ* B, after Aristides.

τοιαῦτα G with MSS. and Aristides: *τοσαῦτ'* B.
ἀγαθά G with MSS.: *τἀγαθά* B.
ὡς, with *τ* added above the line, G: *ὥσθ'* B.

§ 20 *Ἀμφικτύοσι* G: *Ἀμφικτύοσιν* B.
εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ Φω[κέων πρὸς Φίλιπ]που G: om. *ὑπὲρ Φωκέων* B.
ἑαυτῶι G: *αὐτῷ* B.

§ 21 *παρά*, which is bracketed by B, is retained by G, with all MSS.
διδάξαι G: *διδάσκειν* B.
διὰ τοῦτο G: *διὰ ταῦτα* B.
χρήματ' αὐτῶι G: *χρήματθ' ἑαυτῷ* B.

§ 22 Before *ὅτι*, *καὶ λέγειν* is written, but has been struck out.
πρὸς Φίλιππον τὴν εἰρήνην G: *τὴν εἰρήνην πρὸς Φίλιππον* B.
Φιλίππωι, with *ἐκείνωι* written above, G: *ἐκείνῳ* B.
ὡμολόγησεν Εὔβοιαν G: *Εὔβοιαν ὡμολόγηκεν* B.
εἶναι δέ τι G: *εἶναι μέντοι* B.
τοῦτό γε G: *γε* om. B.

§ 23 *καὶ δοκῶν ῥήτωρ* G: *καὶ δοκῶν καὶ ῥήτωρ* B.
οὔ[τε πιστεύει]ν ἠβούλεσθε ἄλλα πλήν G, with MSS.: *οὔτε πιστεύειν ἐβούλεσθε πλήν* B, after Priscian.

§ 24 *ἔμοιγ' ἐδοκεῖτε* G: *ἔμοιγε δοκεῖτε* B.
τοιαῦτα G: *τοσαῦτ'* B, with MSS.
τἄλλα, which is bracketed by B, is retained by G, with all MSS. except Y.
οἱ δ' ἀντιλέγοντες G, with MSS.: *ὁ δ' ἀντιλέγων* B, after Libanius.
καὶ συμφέροντα G with MSS.: *καί* om. B, after Cobet.

§ 27 *οὐδενός* G: *οὐδέν* B.
ὑπῆρχεν G: *ὑπῆρχε* B.

§ 30 *πολλάκις ἀνθρώποις*, bracketed by B, after Sopater, Schol. Plat. Alcib. II. 147 D, etc., is retained by G.
παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις, bracketed by B, after the same authorities, is retained by G.
εἶτα Φωκέας G: *εἶτα καὶ Φωκέας* B.
ἀπολώλεκε G: *ἀπολώλεκεν* B.
τοῦτο δὲ δή G: *τοῦτο δή* B.

τῶν Φωκέων G : τῶν om. B.
ἦκεν G : ἧκε B.
ταῦτα πάντα G : ταῦθ' ἅπαντα B.
ἀπώλεσε τὸ καθ' αὑτόν G : ἀπώλεσεν ἂν καθ' ἑαυτόν B.
§ 31 ἵνα γνῶτε G : ἵν' εἰδῆθ' B.
ἀκούειν παρ' ἐμοῦ [τἀληθῆ] G : ἀκοῦσαι τἀληθῆ παρ' ἐμοῦ B.
ἐπήινησεν G : ἐπῄνεσε B.
φησίν G, with S al. : φήσει B.
§ 32 πρῶτον μέν G, with MSS. except A : μέν om. B.
εἶτα τὸ προβούλευμα, bracketed by B, is retained by G.

Of the 52 divergencies here noted, two (ὥστ' in § 19 and the cancelled καὶ λέγειν in § 22) are not to be reckoned as real variants. Twelve more (not counting cases of non-elision of final vowels, which have not been enumerated) are mere matters of spelling, mainly the omission or retention of the ν ἐφελκυστικόν, which are of interest solely with reference to the principles of rhythm applied by Blass to the text of Demosthenes. Three (§ 19 ἀγαθά, § 21 παρά, § 31 εἶτα τὸ προβούλευμα) are cases in which G supports the unanimous evidence of the MSS. against arbitrary alterations introduced by Blass in obedience to the same principles of rhythm. Two other variants fall practically under the same category: viz. § 24 οἱ δ' ἀντιλέγοντες, where Blass' ὁ δ' ἀντιλέγων has only the support of a passage in Libanius, and the omission of μέν after πρῶτον in § 31, which follows on the removal of εἶτα τὸ προβούλευμα. The great age of the present MS. renders its testimony of some value as to the propriety of the rigid application of the rules against hiatus and the concurrence of three short syllables. In no case does it support alterations which have been made upon these grounds alone.

Of the 33 variants which remain, seven are cases in which the new MS. agrees with the leading extant MSS., as against readings adopted by Blass, generally from some quotation of the passage in other authors. These are § 12 where τούτων εἰς καὶ is retained in almost all MSS., but is omitted, according to Blass, in Vind. 1, 7, schol. p. 348, 21 ; § 19 ἀληθῆ G and MSS.,

τἀληθῆ B from Aristides, avoiding a hiatus; § 19 τοιαῦτα G and MSS., τοσαῦτα B from § 24 (G has τοιαῦτα in both passages, which will seem to recommend the alteration of the vulgate in § 24 rather than in § 19, especially as τηλικαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα is the commoner phrase); § 23 where ἀλλά (MSS.) is omitted by B on the authority of Priscian, but since the present MS. is considerably older than the time of Priscian the balance of authority would appear now to be against his reading; § 26 G supports the retention of καί, which Cobet deletes, and proves that at least the corruption is a very old one; and § 30 πολλάκις ἀνθρώποις and παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις are omitted by Sopater and the Scholiast on Plato's Alcibiades II., supported by Eustathius, all of them authorities later than the present MS., though their concurrence proves the genuine existence of a variant in the tradition. In eight instances the evidence of the MSS. is divided; in § 13 B, apparently with most MSS., has ὧν ὅπερ εἶπον εἰρήκει, S and Q ὥνπερ εἶπον εἰρήκει (S corr. προειρήκει), Q marg. ὧν προειρήκει, the latter being supported by G, without making the reading intrinsically preferable to the vulgate; § 21 G supports the inferior MSS. against S in reading αὑτῷ rather than ἑαυτῷ; § 22 εἶναι μέντοι καὶ ἄλλο B, with SLOY, εἶναι μέντοι τι καὶ ἄλλο other MSS., εἶναι δέ τι καὶ ἄλλο G, where either reading could be explained as derived from the other through the confusion of δέ and μέν in their contracted forms; § 24 ἔμοιγ' ἐδοκεῖτε, the express testimony of G, with several MSS. (but not S) appears preferable in point of sense; § 24 τἄλλα is omitted by Y, retained by all other MSS., including G; § 30 the addition of the article before Φωκέων has the support of FQ and other MSS., but not of S; § 31 φησίν S and others unspecified, supported now by G, φήσει B, apparently with some MS. support, as he does not say that all MSS. are against him; § 32 πρῶτον μέν G and all MSS. except A, which omits μέν, an omission which is only desirable if εἶτα τὸ προβούλευμα be also cancelled; but for this there is no evidence except the occurrence of the tabooed three short syllables and the fact that the words are not essential and may easily have been added.

There remain eighteen readings in which the new MS.

stands alone. Five are cases of simple transposition of words, in which the decision as to the right order must generally be left to personal taste. In § 12 the transposition of ὡς Φίλιππον πέμπειν for πέμπειν ὡς Φίλιππον is a matter almost of indifference, while εἰκότως ταύτην seems to be an improvement in emphasis on ταύτην εἰκότως; § 13 εἶπεν οὗτος for οὗτος εἶπεν is as nearly indifferent as can be; § 14 βραχεῖς εἶπε appears to be inferior to the vulgate εἶπε βραχεῖς: finally in § 22 the reading of G, πρὸς Φίλιππον τὴν εἰρήνην, has the disadvantage of increasing the number of consecutive long syllables. The remaining variants cannot be classified in groups, and may be taken in order. In § 19 ἐὰν τἀληθῆ and ἂν ἀληθῆ are very evenly balanced; in § 20 ὑπὲρ Φωκέων appears superfluous alongside of κατὰ Θηβαίων, and may possibly be a gloss imported into the text; § 21 διδάξαι is perhaps preferable to διδάσκειν, the reference being to a single definite occasion; διὰ τοῦτο is perhaps preferable to διὰ ταῦτα, as avoiding the collocation of two neuter plurals which have nothing to do with one another; § 22 Φιλίππῳ is a cumbrous repetition of the proper name, which already occurs twice in immediate proximity, and is no doubt rightly corrected in the MS. to ἐκείνῳ, the vulgate reading; ὡμολόγησεν can hardly be right, in the face of the perfect δεδώκατε in the parallel clause, and the change of order is injurious to both parallelism and rhythm; and the addition of γε after τοῦτο is harmless but unnecessary. In § 24 τοιαῦτα is supported by the repetition of the phrase in § 19, where G (here unsupported) concurs with the vulgate; § 27 οὐδενός is probably a corruption, and a very natural one; § 30 καί before Φωκέας can well be spared, but on the other hand its insertion is less easily explicable than its omission; δέ is not required with δή after τοῦτο; while τό, if not required with καθ' ἑαυτόν, is yet very possibly right. Finally ἵνα γνῶτε for ἵν' εἰδῆθ' in § 31 is the one passage in which a word wholly different from the vulgate is found, and here it is difficult to say which reading is to be preferred.

Without, however, trying to decide confidently either for or against the readings of the newly discovered MS. in all these passages, it is evident that while they will require to be taken

into consideration by future editors of the speech, they yet present no variations of a startling character. The MS. is singularly free from obvious blunders, and if it had been intact it would have been an authority of the highest importance. As it is, the main conclusion which seems to be derivable from the analysis of its readings is that we have here a confirmation of the general soundness of the text preserved to us in the much later MSS. on which we have hitherto depended. In this respect the new MS. agrees with all the better papyrus MSS. of other authors. It is becoming more and more certain that if our Greek classical texts have been much corrupted since they left the hands of their authors, that corruption must have taken place very early, and must have been due rather to the deliberate alteration of editors than to the ignorant blunders of scribes. Whether a theory of such alteration on a large scale is probable, and whether, if probable, modern scholars are in a position to detect its operations with any confidence, are questions which cannot be discussed here, and on which the best authorities will probably continue to differ.

F. G. KENYON.

ON SOME PASSAGES FROM THE POETAE SCENICI.

νῦν τ', ὦ κράτιστον πᾶσιν Οἰδίπου κάρα,
ἱκετεύομέν σε πάντες οἵδε πρόστροποι
ἀλκήν τιν' εὑρεῖν ἡμίν, εἴτε του θεῶν
φήμην ἀκούσας εἴτ' ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς οἶσθά που·
ὡς τοῖσιν ἐμπείροισι καὶ τὰς ξυμφορὰς
ζώσας ὁρῶ μάλιστα τῶν βουλευμάτων.

Oed. Tyr. 40—45.

This passage already has a literature of its own, and I ought to offer an apology for attempting to add to it. But it cannot be said that any one interpretation at present holds the field, and I may therefore be pardoned for suggesting one more possible explanation of the difficulty. As the passage stands, the choice lies between the rendering of Prof. Jebb and that of Prof. Kennedy. Against accepting the latter I consider Prof. Jebb's objections unanswerable, and they are stated with admirable force in his Appendix. But on the other hand I am unable to accept the traditional explanation, which Prof. Jebb defends. τὰς συμφορὰς τῶν βουλευμάτων does not naturally mean 'issues of counsels' even if the words were not separated, as they are, and it is difficult to extract any sense from ζώσας μάλιστα in this context. If we are to find a sense at all costs, then Prof. Jebb's 'most often have effect' is probably as good a translation as can be given, but I venture to believe that it is only because this translation has become more or less traditional that it is accepted at all, and I am pleased to see in the Classical Review for Jan. 1893 one more protest against accepting as satisfactory any interpretation that has hitherto been given.

The emendation ἥσσους there proposed by Mr Herbert Richards I cannot accept, though I believe it gives the sense we want. But what reason can be assigned for the change of ἥσσους to ζώσας? I propose to read οὔσας for ζώσας, and should translate as follows; "for I see that among men of experience even calamities are most of all dependent upon counsels." This use of εἰμι with a genitive following is a favourite construction of Sophocles, cf. Oed. Tyr. 917, Philoctetes 386 πόλις γάρ ἐστι πᾶσα τῶν ἡγουμένων where Prof. Jebb translates "For an army, like a city, hangs wholly on its leaders." If that translation is applied to the present passage, it will exactly give what I believe to be the right sense. And now, lastly, if Sophocles wrote οὔσας, why was the alteration to ζώσας made? Is it not possible that ζώσας was simply a gloss on οὔσας, added by some copyist who did not understand the passage, but who was aware that οὔσας could be used in the sense of ζώσας? If this is so, it is probable that he was the first to give to the passage what has now become the traditional interpretation, and he ensured the acceptance of his view by substituting ζώσας, which can only be taken in one sense, for οὔσας which admits of two.

> ὅστις ποθ' ὑμῶν Λάϊον τὸν Λαβδάκου
> κάτοιδεν ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τίνος διώλετο,
> τοῦτον κελεύω πάντα σημαίνειν ἐμοί·
> κεἰ μὲν φοβεῖται, τοὐπίκλημ' ὑπεξελὼν
> αὐτὸς καθ' αὑτοῦ· πείσεται γὰρ ἄλλο μὲν
> ἀστεργὲς οὐδέν, γῆς δ' ἄπεισιν ἀβλαβής.
>
> 224—229.

Prof. Jebb reads ὑπεξελεῖν αὐτὸν and translates "I bid him to declare all to me. And if he is afraid, I tell him to remove the danger of the charge from his path by denouncing himself." If any alteration is necessary, this is probably the best, but it seems to me that the passage may be fairly construed as it stands if l. 226 is taken differently. I should translate "if anyone knows by whom Laius was slain, I bid every one to denounce this man to me. And if he (i.e. the guilty man) is afraid, having removed from his path the charge (i.e. the being

charged by others) let him denounce himself, for he shall suffer nothing else" etc.

πάντα in l. 226 is everyone who knows the guilty man. l. 227 supposes the guilty man to be afraid of being denounced, and invites him to do away with the chance of being accused by others, by accusing himself. With most editors I understand *σημαινέτω* after *αὐτὸς καθ' αὑτοῦ*.

> *πάντες γὰρ οὐ φρονεῖτ'. ἐγὼ δ' οὐ μή ποτε*
> *τἄμ', ὡς ἂν εἴπω μὴ τὰ σ', ἐκφήνω κακά.*
>
> 328, 329.

Probably no passage in the play except 44—45 has been discussed so much as this, but here too it cannot be said even now that any one interpretation has gained universal assent. Prof. Jebb punctuates as above, and translates "I will never reveal my (not to call them thy) griefs." Now there may be justification for the grammar of this, and therefore I hesitate to express my dissent, but at present I can find no parallel passage. *ὡς ἂν* appears to be used for *ὡς* in final clauses only after an imperative or the equivalent to an imperative, and the passage quoted by Prof. Jebb from Ar. Av. 1508 *τὸ σκιάδειον ὑπέρεχε ἄνωθεν, ὡς ἂν μή μ' ἴδωσιν οἱ θεοί* is an instance of this rule. It does not therefore justify taking *ὡς ἂν μὴ εἴπω* in the sense which he gives it in this passage. I feel too myself some difficulty in taking *τἀμά* with *κακά*, for it does not seem quite natural that Teiresias should refer to his knowledge of the *κακά* of Oedipus as *τὰ ἐμὰ κακά*.

Prof. Kennedy takes the passage thus: *ἐγὼ δ' οὐ μήποτε εἴπω τἀμὰ* (I will never speak my things) *ὡς ἂν* (*εἴπω*) however I may call them (whatever they may deserve to be called) *μὴ τὰ σ' ἐκφήνω κακά* lest I disclose your things as evil. The objection which I feel to this is that *ὡς ἂν εἴπω* "however I may call them" does not give us the sense we require. I venture to propose *εἰδῶ* for *εἴπω*, and should translate "But mine, however I may know, I will never disclose, lest I disclose thy evils." Knowledge of these troubles—it is only fair to remember—Teiresias has already claimed: almost his first words were *ταῦτα γὰρ καλῶς ἐγὼ εἰδὼς διώλεσ'*. And if it be fair to press

the invidious sense of *ξυνειδὼς* in 330, we may observe that, though Oedipus allows the first confession of knowledge in 318 to pass unchallenged, when that confession is repeated in 329, he is by this time so angry that he at once assumes that knowledge is equivalent to complicity. It will be seen that I take *ἐκφήνω* twice over, first with *οὐ μή ποτε τἄμ'*, and then in its own clause. I should suggest that *εἰδῶ* was altered to *εἴπω* to provide a more suitable verb to govern *τἀμά*.

ἀλλ' οὔ τι μὴν ἔγωγε τοῦ λοιποῦ χρόνου
ξύνοικος ἔσσομ', ἀλλὰ τῇδε πρὸς πύλῃ
παρεῖσ' ἐμαυτὴν ἄφιλος αὐανῶ βίον.

Soph. El. 818.

Dindorf retains the MSS. reading, which must be wrong, nor are any of the emendations proposed satisfactory, though Hermann's *ξύνοικος εἴσειμ'*, which Prof. Jebb reluctantly accepts, is perhaps the best. I propose *ξύνοικος ἐς στόμ'* as involving only the insertion of one letter: *αὐανῶ βίον* is strictly speaking to be taken with both clauses, but it is naturally kept to the end of the sentence to which it chiefly belongs and where its position is most forcible.

οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα, βακχεύσεις δ' ἰών,
μηδ' ἐξομόρξει μωρίαν τὴν σὴν ἐμοί.

Eur. Bacch. 243.

A prohibition, says Goodwin, begun by *οὐ μή* with the future may be continued by *μηδέ* with another future form, and he quotes this passage adding "here *μηδέ* continues the original prohibition as if there had been no interruption." But it is just this very interruption which seems to me so very abnormal. I do not see how Euripides can have written "Don't do this, but go and do that, and don't do this other thing." The positive command between two prohibitions seems impossible. I should read *ἰδὼν* for *δ' ἰὼν*, a change which only involves the transposition of two letters, and I should take *βακχεύσεις* as the plural of *βάκχευσις*. The sense will then be "Do not bring your hand near me, you that have looked on Bacchic rites, nor

wipe off your folly on me." There is no reason why *βάκχευσις* should not be used in the plural; *ὕβρεις* occurs once in this very play, and as far as I know nowhere else.

ΠΕ. *οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην θῆλυν ἐνδῦναι στολήν.*
ΔΙ. *ἀλλ' αἶμα θήσεις, ξυμβαλὼν βάκχαις μάχην.*
ΠΕ. *ὀρθῶς· μολεῖν χρὴ πρῶτον ἐς κατασκοπήν.*
Bacchae 836—838.

Line 837 is difficult, and has been emended in various ways: as it stands it does not seem to supply any adequate reason for the *ὀρθῶς* of the next line. *εἶμα* has been proposed as an emendation, but even so the sense is not quite satisfactory. I imagine that the sound of *εἶμα* and *αἶμα* would be identical, and that Dionysus intends Pentheus to understand him to be speaking of *εἶμα* while the audience will not fail to see that *αἶμα*, bloodshed, will be the result of a conflict with the Bacchants. But Pentheus, supposing him to mean "you will lay aside your woman's robe, after you have fought," answers *ὀρθῶς*, and is willing to admit the necessity of first going as a spy.

One passage from Aristophanes may conclude these notes. The difficulty in Aves 337 has been already pointed out in the New Phrynichus. The MSS. there give

ταῦτα μὲν λῃρεῖς ἔχων
κάρτα· πῶς κλαύσει γὰρ ἢν ἅπαξ γε τὠφθαλμὼ 'κκοπῇς;

How are we to explain the presence of *κάρτα* in a passage which can hardly be a parody from Tragedy, and indeed seems to have no tragic associations whatever? Is it possible that Aristophanes wrote *χαρτά*? In that case the meaning will be "What nonsense you are talking! you have reason to be glad: for how can you cry if your eyes are once pecked out?"

HUGH MACNAGHTEN.

NOTE ON THE FOURTH PYTHIAN.

It has been more than once pointed out how much the last verse of each strophe and antistrophe depends for its striking rhythmical effect upon the short syllables with which it begins: should anyone doubt this, let him take, say, line 177, *ἔμολεν εὐαίνητος Ὀρφεύς*, and for *ἔμολεν* substitute *ἦλθεν*: or in line 246, *τέλεσαν ἂν πλαγαὶ σιδάρου*, substitute *τεῦξαν* for *τέλεσαν*.

And in this long ode there are three cases, no more (out of 26), where the first two short syllables are represented by one long one: 31 *δεῖπν' ἐπαγγέλλοντι πρῶτον*[1], 54 *Φοῖβος ἀμνάσει θέμισσιν*, 108 *Αἰόλῳ καὶ παισὶ τιμάν*. Here the ear suffers, or but for habituation would suffer, as much as in the substitutions suggested above. But has it ever been pointed out that in each of these cases the long syllable is a diphthong: and in each it is possible by merely resolving the diphthong to restore the normal rhythm? This can hardly be accidental. I conceive then we ought to pronounce the lines thus:

δέϊπν' ἐπαγγέλλοντι πρῶτον
Φόϊβος ἀμνάσει θέμισσιν
Ἀϊόλῳ καὶ παισὶ τιμάν.

Etymologically indeed, as I am informed, the diphthongs in question cannot be regarded as dissyllabic: but I cannot see that this is any reason why each of the two vowels should not have been sung as a distinct musical note.

[1] Mommsen reads *δέπας* from his own conjecture, which no one, I believe, has adopted.

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

SOME NEW PAPYRI FROM APOLLONOPOLIS.

In 1892 the Rev. A. C. Headlam brought from Egypt a number of papyri. These he entrusted to Mr F. Madan, by whose kind permission I have been allowed to work at them. Two of these papyri, bought at Esneh, were both longer and more complete than the rest, though both were considerably mutilated. In one of them two or three lines at the beginning were lost, and of the first nine lines only a few letters were left, while throughout the rest of the document at least one-third on the right hand side had been broken off. But on subsequently visiting the British Museum, I discovered that by a fortunate accident the missing part on the right hand side from line 7 onwards was among the large collection recently acquired by the British Museum, most of which is as yet unpublished. This document, therefore, which I shall call No. 1, is after line 9 nearly perfect. The other papyrus of Mr Headlam, No. 2, which in style closely resembles No. 1, has been broken parallel with the writing, not, as No. 1, at right angles to it, and is therefore nearly perfect so far as it goes, but it has lost a large amount at the beginning, and a few lines at the end. In addition to these two papyri I gave a transcription of another papyrus of a very similar character, No. 3, which is in the British Museum. This also is considerably mutilated, having lost about 15 lines at the beginning, as well as about 10 letters at the end of each line. The lacunae in it however can in most cases be filled up from the other two, while it in turn sometimes supplements their deficiencies.

These three documents are all contracts for the sale of house property at Apollonopolis Magna, the modern Edfu, not far from

Thebes. In their general style they may be compared to Nos. 21 and 21bis of the Louvre collection (Notices et Extraits, vol. xviii. 2), and two papyri, also at Paris, published by Professor A. H. Sayce in the Revue des études grecques vol. iii. 131. In No. 1 John the son of Pistoïs and his mother Aurelia Martha agree to sell to Aurelius Victor and his wife Aurelia Heracis the half of their house for $1\frac{2}{3}$ solidi "according to the standard of Apollonopolis." Appended are the autograph signatures of the vendors and five witnesses. In No. 2 the names of the buyers and sellers, as well as the signatures, are lost. The sum to be paid was $4\frac{2}{3}$ solidi for a house or part of one, and the pasture land attached to it. In No. 3 Pistoïs, head of the monastery of Abba Cyrus, agrees to sell to Zacharias and some other person, whose name is lost, one-third of a house, bequeathed to the monastery by Tachymia daughter of Sansnotus. The sum paid was one solidus and a fraction, the determination of which is doubtful. At the end are the autograph signatures of the vendor and witnesses. With regard to the dates of the papyri, No. 1 was written in the reign of Heraclius and his son Heraclius Novus Constantinus on Tybi 8th 6th indiction. As the 6th indiction fell twice in Heraclius' reign, this would suit Jan. 3rd either 618 or 633 A.D. But of these two years the earlier is almost certainly the right date. The point at issue turns upon the question, who the Nicetas mentioned in line 20 was. The most famous person of this name was Nicetas son of Gregoras: he was first cousin of the emperor Heraclius, and helped him to overthrow Phocas. Nicephorus (p. 5 B ed. Bekker) relates that on Nicetas' arrival at Byzantium, Heraclius *αὐτὸν ὥσπερ ἀδελφὸν γνήσιον καὶ ὁμότιμον δέχεται*, and made him "Patrician," cf. l. 21 *Νικήτα τοῦ πανευφήμου καὶ ὑπερφυεστάτου πατρικίου*. Nicephorus does not state when he died, but in 630 (p. 15 B) Heraclius caused the marriage to take place between his eldest son, Heraclius Novus Constantinus, and the daughter of Nicetas, Gregoria, *ἦν δὴ καὶ προμνηστευσάμενος ἦν περιόντος ἔτι τοῦ αὐτῆς πατρός*. From this it appears that Nicetas had died before 630, and therefore, if, as is practically certain, he is the person mentioned in line 20, the papyrus was written in 618. There

is just a possibility that the Nicetas in question may have been the son of the above-mentioned, and as he was not made "Patrician" until 630 (Niceph. l. c.), in that case the year 633 would be meant. But in the passage of Nicephorus (15 B), where his name is given as Nicetas, the text is corrupt, and if Petavius' emendation be accepted, he was simply called "the son of Nicetas." Moreover, even granting that his name was Nicetas, he never attained to the prominence of his father, so that we should not expect to find his name coupled with those of Heraclius and Heraclius Novus in an oath (see ll. 19, 20).

In No. 3 the emperors Heraclius and Heraclius Novus Constantinus are mentioned. The papyrus therefore must have been written between 613, when the younger Heraclius was associated with his father in the empire, and 640, by which time the Arabs were in full possession of Egypt.

In No. 2 there is nothing to indicate the date, but the close similarity both in phraseology and handwriting, which exists between this papyrus and the other two, shows that it belongs to the first half of the 7th century.

The handwriting of the body of the documents is in all three cases of a good-sized, remarkably upright, semi-cursive character. The signatures in Nos. 1 and 3 are in all kinds of hands, uncial and cursive, good and bad. One or two of them, which are very rough and uneducated, present some difficulties, especially in the decipherment of proper names.

The texts are printed just as they are, except that the words are correctly separated, and proper names have a capital letter. There are no stops, breathings, or accents, but the diaeresis or a curved line is sometimes placed over ι and υ either at the beginning of a word, or in order to separate vowels, and the apostrophe is twice used as sign of elision in No. 3. Proper names occasionally have a line over them. Square brackets indicate a lacuna, and, where it is not filled up, the number of dots approximately represents the number of letters lost, though the irregularity of the writing, especially at the end of a line, renders this often very doubtful. Dots underneath a letter indicate that the reading is doubtful, unless it is stated to be otherwise, because only a part of the letter is left.

Before proceeding to the transcriptions, I must thank Mr E. Maunde Thompson and Mr Headlam for their permission to publish these papyri, and especially Mr F. G. Kenyon for his very kind help throughout.

No. 1, Brit. Mus. No. 210, Mr Headlam having now presented his part of this papyrus, as well as No. 2, to the British Museum.

[†εν ονοματι της αγιας και ζωοποιου τριαδος πατρος και υιου και αγιου πνευματος]

1. και μ[. . . . . βασιλειας του]
2. γαλην[οτατου ημων δεσποτου Φλς Ηρακλειου . . . . . .]
3. †Ἰωαννι[ης υιος Πιστωιτος ελαχς αναγνωστης αγιας εκκλησιας Απολλωνος]
4. και η τουτ[ου μητηρ Αυρηλια Μαρθα θυγατηρ Σουρουτος εκ μητρος Σοφιας]
5. ορμωμ[ενοι . . . . .]
6. Ιωαννη[ς και Μαρθα οι προγεγραμμενοι παρεχοντες υπε]ρ [αυτων]
7. υπογρ[αφεα . . . . .] της υπογραφοντα κ[αι]
8. μαρτυρ[ας . . . . . μαρ]τυρουντων τη παρουση βεβαια
9. και απᾳ[ραβατω πρασει] †Αυρηλιοις Βικτορι
10. ϋιω Δανι[η]λιου Τανουβε[. . . . .]ες Σαβινου και τη τουτο
11. συμβιω Ηραειδος εκ πατρος Ζαχαριας εκ μητρος Τερητ απο της
12. αυτης πολεως χαιρ/ ομολογουμεν ημεις οι προγεγραμμενοι
13. Ἰωαννης και Μαρθης η τουτο μητηρ εκοντες και πεπεισμενοι
14. ανευ παντος δολου και φοβου και βιας και απατης και αναγκης

15. και συ[ναρ]παγης και οια[σ]δη[πο]τε κακονοιας και κακοηθειας
16. και παν[το]ς ελαττωματος και πασ[ης ν]ομιμου περιγραφης
17. αμα δε επωμοσαμεθα προς δε της αγιας και ομοουσιου τριαδα
18. και νικην και διαμονην των γαληνοτατων και θεοστηρικτων
19. ημων δεσποτων ΦΛ′Λ′ Ηρακλειου και Ηρακλειου νεου Κωνσταντινου
20. των αιωνιων αυγουστων αυτοκρατορων και Νικητα του πανευφημου και
21. υπερφυ[εστα]του πατρικιου πεπ[ρα]κεναι σημερον κατα τηνδε την
22. ωνιακ[ην] ασφαλειαν ὑμιν τοις προγεγ[ραμ]μενοις Βικτορι και Ηραειδι
23. συμβιω και καταγεγραφηκεναι ωνιακω νομω και πληρεστατω παντι
24. δεσποτε[ι]ας δικαιω επ αιωνια κατοχη απο του νυν επι τον εξης και
25. αει απαντα διηνεκη χρονον το ὑπαρχον και διαφερον ημιν
26. νοτινον ημισυ μερος απο του απηλιωτικου συμποσιου ανεωγμενην
27. επι λι[βος] και το ημισυ του αερος αυ[του α]π̣α̣ν̣ εν τη οικια Ταχτωρε
28. διακειμενον εν τω ὑψωματι της πολε[ως] επι λαυρας Τσιωθωρ
29. και την αναλογιαν ημων απο του πυλωνος και του πεσσου και
30. μετα της εισοδου και εξοδου και ανοδου και καθοδου και απο παντων
31. των κοινωνιμιαιων τοπων και ομολογουμεν του λοιπου μηδε εν μερος η δικαιον
32. υπολειπεσθαι ημιν απο του αυτου συμποσιου και του αερος αυτου και απο παντων
33. των κο[ινω]νιμιαιων τοπων ως ειρηται [. . .]ε[. .] ελθον εις ημας απο διαδοχης

34. Πιστωϊτος του μακαριτου εμου μεν Ιωαννης [π]ατρος εμου δε **Μαρθης ανδρος**
35. γειτονες δε της αυτης ολης οικιας νοτου ρυμη δημοσια **απηλιωτου οικια των**
36. κληρ[ον]ομων τ Κυρου βορρα οικια τ Βενκημ και ρυμη δημοσια **λιβος**
37. ρυμη δημοσια εις ην ανεωκται η θυρα της αυτης οικιας **η οι δ αν ωσι**
38. γειτονες παντη παντοθεν καθως ημει[ς οι] αποδομενοι στοματι υπηγορευσαμεν
39. τιμης της προς αλληλους συμπεφων[ημεν]ης και συναρεσασης μεταξυ
40. ημων αμφοτερων επι βεβαιω και αμεταθετω λογω χρυσου δοκιμου
41. νομι[σμ]ατιου ενος διμοιρου ζυγω Απολλωνος γι/ χρ/ **ν° α„> μονς ηνπερ**
42. τελειαν τιμην αυτοθι απεσχηκαμεν παρ υμων των ωνουμενων
43. απο χειρος εις χειρας ημων εξ οικου ὑμων αριθμω και πληρηαιω σταθμω
44. επ οψεσι [τ]ων εξης υπογραφοντων μαρ[τυρω]ν προς τω υμας τους
45. ωνουμενους εντευθεν και επι το διηνεκες κρατειν και κυριευειν
46. και δεσποζειν κατα παν δεσποτειας αναφαιρετου δικαιον και οικειν
47. και δι[ο]ικειν και οικοδομειν και ανοικοδομειν και εκχωρειν και παραχωρειν
48. και μετασχηματιζειν και εκμισθουν και εναλλαττειν και νεμεσθαι και
49. πωλειν και χαρισασθαι και τεκνοις μεταδιδοναι και κληρονομοις
50. καταλιμπανειν και διαδοχοις και διακ[ατο]χοις και χρασθαι περι αυτων
51. τροπω παντι υμιν αρεσκοντι ακωλυτως και ανεμποδιστως
52. βεβαι[ο]υν τε και αποσοβησειν την παρουσαν πρασιν δια παντος
53. απο παντος του επελευσομενου η αντιποιησομενου τον δε επελευσομενον

54. η αντιποιησομενον παραχρημα ημεις οι πεπρακοτες εκστησομεν και
55. εκδικ[η]σομεν και αποσοβησομεν κ[αι κ]αθαροποιησομεν ταυτην
56. την πρασιν ἰδιοις ημων αναλωμασι και κινδυνω κατα τον περι πρασεως
57. και βεβαιωσεως νομον ει δε ασθενειμεν περι την εκδικησιν και
58. καθαροποιησιν ταυτης της πρασεως ετοιμως εχομεν παρασχειν ὑμιν
59. την εγκειμενην τιμην εν διπλω και ει τ[ι] δ αν φανειητε αναλωσαντες
60. εις τε οικοδομην και ανανεωσιν και ε̣τ̣[ερ]αν επιμελειαν και αυτα
61. εν διπλῃ ποσοτητι μετα και του μηδεν ισχυειν κατα των εμφερομενων
62. τη παρουση πρασει αλλ εφ ω αυτην και παν μερος αυτης κυριαν ειναι και βεβαιαν
63. καθοτι και εστιν επι το διηνεκες ηπερ απλην γραφεισαν εξεδομεθα ὑμιν
64. προς ασφαλειαν υμων ατρωτοι και απαραβατον απαντα̣χου προφερομενην
65. εν δημοσιω αρχειω γεγενημενην και κατα [νο]μους τετελειωμενην και
66. εις τα προγεγραμμενα παντα επερωτηθεντες ωμολογησαμεν†
67. εν ονοματι της αγιας και ζωοποιου τριαδος πατρος και υιου και αγιο¯ πνευματος
68. Τυβι ογδοη της εκτης ἰνδικτιονος εν Απολλωνος ανω πολει††
69. † Ἰωαννης υϊος Πιστωιτος ελαχ αναγνωστης αγιας εκκλησιας
70. Απολλωνος ο προγεγραμμενος εθεμην την παρουσαν πρασιν
71. και στοιχει μοι παντα τα εγγραμμ[ε]να ως προκειται†
72. †Αυρηλια Μαρθα θυγατηρ Σουρουτος εκ μητρος Σουφιας η προγεγραμμενη
73. εθεμην την παρουσαν πρασιν και στοιχει μοι αμα Ιωαννην του εμου υιου

74. παντα τα εγγεγραμμενα ως προκειται †Φλς Σαβινος Αρσιλιου αιτηθεις παρ αυτης

75. ὑπεγραψα υπερ αυτης γραμματα μη ειδυῖης ††Φλς Αριστοφανης ποτ/ νιος του της μακαρ/

76. μνημης [. .] θ̣οδωρου μαρτυρω τη παρουση πρασει αιτηθεις παρα των θεμενων†

77. †Θεοδοσιος υιος Γεωργιου μαρτυρ τη πα[ρ]ουση πρασει αιτηθεις παρα των θεμεν†

78. †Φλς Ηααμ απα Διου πρ/.. μαρτυ[ρω] τη παρουση πρασει αιτηθεις παρα των θεμενων

79. †Κυριλλος Παπνουθιου ελαχς διακς μαρτυρω τη πρασει κατ αιτησιν των θεμενων†

80. †Φλς Αθους υιος Παυλου μαρτυρω τηδε τη πρασει εξ αιτησεως των θεμενων†

81. δι εμου Ηρακλειδου εγραφη†

Notes on No. 1.

1 and 2. These lines, as the space left in the papyrus between ll. 2 and 3 shows, belong to the introduction. It is doubtful how many lines are lost before 1, but as εν ονοματι κ.τ.λ. only requires one line (see line 67), it is not necessary to suppose the loss of more than one. και μ[: the usual formula, when expressed in full, continues after εν ονοματι κ.τ.λ., και της δεσποινης ημων της θεοτοκου και αειπαρθενου Μαριας και παντων των αγιων βασιλειας κ.τ.λ., but if μ̣[... be the beginning of the name Μαριας, the order is not the ordinary one.

2. We should expect the date to follow the mention of the emperor, as is the rule in law documents of the Byzantine period, see Justinian Novella 47. But in line 68 the date is given : cf. the custom in the first 3 centuries A.D. of putting the date at the end. So perhaps it was not given here. Possibly the younger Heraclius was mentioned, as in line 19.

3 and 4. These lines can be restored with tolerable certainty from the signatures at the end of the papyrus.

5. Probably ορμωμενοι απο της.....κωμης (or πολεως) νυν δε την οικησιν εχοντες εν Απολλωνος ανω πολει. For this formula see Dr

Wessely's account of the Paris Fayum papyri in Denkschr. d. k. Akad. in Wien, Bd. xxxvii. p. 113.

6. παρεχοντες κ.τ.λ. : a common formula. Cf. Par. pap. No. 21, line 7, and 21bis, line 4; but the continuation of it there does not suit what is left of lines 7 and 8 here.

9. απαραβατω. Cf. l. 64. Probably nothing is lost after πρασει, a space being left before the names of the buyers.

10. The name of the place where Aurelius Victor lived has probably dropped out, as appears from απο της αυτης πολεως in the next line. τουτο for τουτου, cf. l. 13.

11. Ηραειδος should be Ηραειδι, see l. 22. The declension of the proper names in these papyri abounds in mistakes.

12. χαιρ/ = χαιρειν.

13. Μαρθης should be Μαρθα.

17. προς δε της αγιας....τριαδα. δε = τε. δ and τ are not infrequently confused in papyri of this date. There is a mixture of two constructions after επωμοσαμεθα (1) the accusative, (2) προς with the genitive.

19. ΦΛ′Λ′ = Φλαουιων. Cf. l. 9 Αυρηλιοις. The younger Heraclius is not usually mentioned together with his father, but see a fragment at Berlin, quoted by Dr Magirus in Wiener Studien viii. 97.

20. Nicetas. On the importance of this mention of him for deciding the date of the papyrus, see above.

27. αερος seems here to mean the "area."

28. Τσιωθωρ. A parallel to such a collocation of consonants at the beginning of a name is Τσεμμινει in Pap. Par. No. 9. (Notices et Extraits xviii. 2.) It is just possible the second letter is ο.

29. αναλογια = "share." πεσσου: a structure supporting the arch: see Strabo xvi. 5.

33. Perhaps [π]ε[ρι]ελθον. cf. υπαρχον.....και περιελθον in the two papyri published by Professor Sayce in the Revue des études grecques; or possibly εισελθον should be read.

34. In 73 Ιωαννην is used for the genitive.

36. τ Κυρου.... τ Βενκημ: τ is found in abbreviated documents for του, and apparently it has that meaning here, though proper names do not elsewhere in these papyri have the article, and this papyrus is remarkably free from abbreviations.

41. γι/ κ.τ.λ. = γι(νεται) χρ(υσου) νο(μισμα) $1\frac{2}{3}$. >: this sign for $\frac{2}{3}$ occurs also in No. 2, line 4. It seems to be new. Dr Wessely (l. c.

No. XXXVIII.) quotes *y* as a sign for $\frac{2}{3}$ and pap. Brit. Mus. No. 119, line 42, has *o'* for the same fraction. The two short strokes below the line appear to belong to the α not to the fraction. μονς = μονον.

43. πληρηαιω for πληρει.

67. αγιο¯ = αγιον. Cf. No. 3 passim.

69. ελαχ = ελαχιστος. This and the two following lines are written in rough uncials.

70. αγιας εκκλησιας Απολλωνος. We should have expected πολεως to be expressed, but the town is spoken of simply as "Apollo." Cf. ζυγω Απολλωνος.

74. Φλς = Φλαουιος. πολ/ = πολιτης. μακαρ/ μακαριας.

76. Perhaps [Πυ]θοδωρου, but the θ is doubtful.

77. θεμεν †. The final -ων is left out for want of space.

78. πρ/, if this be the correct reading, πρεσβυτερος. The next two letters look like a θ or ο and ρ. The stroke after πρ may be an ι, so that the whole possibly forms a proper name. The faded ink adds to the difficulty.

79. ελαχς διακς = ελαχ(ιστος) διακ(ονος). κατ¯ = κατα.

No. 2.

1. [. . . . . καθως ημεις οι αποδομενοι σ]τ[ο]μ[α]τ[ι υπη]-γ[ο]ρ[ευσα]μ[ε]ν τιμης
2. της προς αλληλους συμπεφων[ημ]ενης και συναρεσασης μεταξυ
3. ημων αμφοτερων επι βεβαιω κα[ι α]μεταθετω λογω χρυσου δοκιμου
4. νομισματων τεσσαρων διμοιρου ζυγω Απολλωνος γι/ χρ/ ν° δ„> μονς ηνπερ
5. τελειαν τιμην αυτοθι απεσχηκαμεν παρ υμων των ωι ου-μενων
6. απο χειρος εις χειρας ημων εξ οικου υμων αριθμω και σταθμω πληρει και
7. βεβαιωσομεν ὕμιν τηνδε την πρασιν και την νομην παση βεβαιωσει
8. δια παντος απο παντος του επελευσομενου η αντιποιη-σομενου τον δε
9. επελευσομενον η αντιποιησομενον παραχρημα ημεις οι πεπρακοτες

10. εκστησομεν και εκδικησομεν και αποσοβησομεν και καθαροποιησομεν
11. ταυτην την πρασιν ιδιοις ημων αναλωμασι και κινδυνω κατα τον
12. περι πρασεως και βεβαιωσεως νομον προς τω εντευθεν και επι το διηνεκες
13. τους ωνουμενους κρατειν και κυ[ρ]ιευειν και δεσποζειν κατα παν δεσποτειας
14. αναφαιρετου δικαιον και οικειν και οικοδομειν και ανοικοδομ̣ε̣ς
15. και εκχωρειν και παραχωρειν και εκμισθουν και εναλλαττειν και πωλειν και
16. χαρισασθαι και τεκνοις μεταδιδοναι και κληρονομοις καταλιμπανειν
17. και διαδοχοις και διακατοχοις και παντα απλως ειπειν πραττειν επ αυτου
18. οσα νομοι επιτρεπουσι τοις α[υτο]τελεσει δεσποταις κυριως και ανεπικωλυτως
19. ει δε ασθενησοιμεν περι την εκδικησιν και καθαροποιησιν ταυτης της
20. πρασεως ετοιμως εχομεν παρασχειν ὑμιν την εγκειμενην τιμην εν διπλω
21. και ει τι δ αν φανειητε αναλωσαντες εις τε οικοδομην και ανανεωσιν
22. και αυτα [ε]ν διπλη ποσοτητι μετ[α] και του μηδεν ἰσχυειν κατα των εμφερομ̣ε̣/
23. τ[η] π[α]ρ[ουση πρασει] αλλ εφ ω αυτην ειναι και παν μερος αυτης κυριαν
24. ειναι και βεβαιαν καθοτι και εστιν επι το διηνεκες ηνπερ απλην
25. γραφ[εισα]ν εξεδομεθα ὑμιν πρ[ο]ς ασφαλειαν ὑμων ατρωτον και απαραβατον
26. απαντ[αχο]υ προφερομενην κ[αι] εις τα προγεγραμμενα παντα επερωτηθεντες
27. ωμολ[ογησα]μεν† δ̣[. .]αθηκῳ̣[. .] εξητησαμεν την προκτητικην ωνην
28. μη συμ[. . . . .]μεν προς τ[ο π]αρον ει δ̣ε̣[. . . . .] εν ποτε καιρω η παρ ημων η παρα των

29. ημων [κ]λ[ηρονο]μων εφ ω ημας [. . . . .]ι ὕμιν η τουτ
ακυρον ειναι και
30. ανισχ[υ]ρον ᾳπ[. . . . .]ῳμενην και επι τουτω ωμο-
λογησαμεν†

Notes on No. 2.

1. Cf. No. 1, line 38, from which I have filled up the lacunae here. As far as line 27, No. 2 closely resembles No. 1, though the order of some of the formulae is different.

4. γι/ κ.τ.λ. = γι(νεται) χρ(υσου) νο(μισματα) $4\frac{2}{3}$. Cf. note on No. 1, line 41. μονς = μονον.

14. ανοικοδομ$\overset{\epsilon}{\varsigma}$ = ανοικοδομε(ιν).

18. α[υτο]τελεσει. Cf. No. 3, line 33, αυτοτελεσι δεσποταις.

22. εμφερομ$\overset{\epsilon}{/}$ = εμφερομε(νων).

23. The lacuna is filled up from No. 1, line 62. The first ειναι here is superfluous.

27 sqq. Usually the formula εις τα προγεγραμμενα κ.τ.λ. is followed immediately by the signatures. I have been unable to find any parallel to the present passage. The last four lines of this papyrus, which is made up of more than 50 pieces, are very fragmentary, and in some places have been rubbed.

No. 3. Brit. Mus. No. 211.

. . . . . Φλ′λ′ Ηρακλειου]

1. [κα]ι Ηρακλειο$\overset{\upsilon}{}$ νεου Κωνσταν[τινου των αιωνιων αυγουστ-
των]
2. αυτοκρατορων πεπρακεναι ση[μερον σοι τω π]ρ[ογεγραμ-
μενω Ζαχαρια]
3. κατα τηνδε την εγγραφον ωνιακ[η]ν ασφαλει[αν και
καταγεγραφηκεναι]
4. ωνιακω νομω και πληρεστατω παντι δεσποτε[ιας δικαιω
επ αιωνια]
5. κατοχη απο του νυν επι τον εξης και αε[ι απαντα διη-
νεκη χρονον]
6. το ανηκον και διαφερον του αυτου αγιο¯ μοναστηρι[ου]
π̄[αρα]

7. Ταχυμιας της μακαριας θυγατρος Σανσνωτου τριτο[ν μερος απο της]
8. οικιας αυτης της και διακειμενης εν τω υψωματι της π[ολεως .....]
9. του αγιο¯ σεπτο¯ τοπου αββα Κυρου απο εδαφο¯ αχρι αερος [μετα της εισοδου]
10. και εξοδο¯ και ανοδου και καθοδου και παντων των κοινον[ιμιαιων τοπων]
11. κατα το αυτο τριτον μερος και ομολογω του λοιπου μηδε εν [μερος η δικαιον]
12. ὑπολιπεισθαι του αυτο¯ αγιο¯ μοναστηριου δι εμο¯ Πιστωΐτος [ελαχς διακς και]
13. προεστωτος του αυτου αγιο¯ τοπου και της δωρεαστικης σ[.....]
14. παρα της αυτης μακαριας Ταχυμιας εις τον αυτον αγιον τ[οπον και τας]
15. αυτης προσφορας αναδεδωκα σοι παρ εμου εις μειζονα [.....]
16. εισι δε γειτονες της αυτης οικιας νοτου κοινος τοιχος μεταξυ αυτης κ[αι ..... βορρα]
17. ωσαυτως κοινος τοιχος απηλιωτου και λιβος ρυμαι δημοσιαι ανεωκται η [θυρα η οι δ αν ωσι]
18. γειτονες παντη παντοθεν καθως εγω ο αποδομενος [στοματι υπηγορευσα]
19. τιμης της προς αλληλους συμπεφωνημενης και συναρεσασ[ης μεταξυ ημων]
20. αμφοτερων επι βεβαιω και αμεταθετω λογω χρυσου νομι[σματιου ενος .....]
21. ζυγω Απολλωνος γι/ χρ/ ν° αγν„ μονς ηνπερ τελειαν τιμην τ[ου τριτου]
22. μερους απο της οικιας Ταχυμιας της μακαριας αυτοθι απε[σ]χ[ηκα παρα σου]·
23. του ωνουμενου απο χειρος εις χειρας μου εξ οικου ϙ[ου αριθμω και]
24. σταθμω πληρει προς τω ὑμιν τους προγεγραμμενους Ζαχαριαν [και .....]
25. εντευθεν και επι το διηνεκες αυτου του ειρημενο¯ τρι[του μερους απο της]

οικιας της μακαριας Ταχυμιας απο εδαφου αχρι αερος και π̣[αντων των]
κοινονιμιαιων τοπον και της εισοδου και εξοδου και ανοδο[υ και καθοδου]
κατα το αυτο τριτον μερος κρατειν και κυριευειν και δεσποζει[ν κατα παν]
δεσποτειας αναφαιρετου δικαιον και οικειν και διοικειν [και μετασχηματιζειν]
και οικοδομειν και ανοικοδομειν και εκχωρειν και παραχωρει[ν και εκμισθουν]
και εναλλαττειν και πωλειν και χαρισασθαι και τεκνοις μεταδι[δοναι και κληρονομοις]
καταλιμπανειν και διαδοχοις και διακατοις και παντα απλ[ως ειπειν πραττειν]
επ αυτω οσα νομοι επιτρεπουσι τοις αυτοτελεσι δεσποταις [κυριως και]
ανεπικωλυτως και βεβαιωσω σοι ταυτην την πρασιν [και αποσοβησω]
δια παντος απο παντος το¯ επελευσομενου η αντιποιησ[ομενου τον δε]
επελευσομενον η αντιποιησομενον παραχρημα εγω ο π[επρακως . . . . . .]
η και παντας τους μετ εμου οικονομησαντων εκστησω [και εκδικησω]
και αποσοβησω και καθαροποιησω ταυτην την [π]ρ[ασιν ιδιοις μου]
αναλωμασι και κινδυνω κατα τον περι πρασεως και βεβα[ιωσεως νομον]
ει δε ασθενησοιμι περι την εκδικησιν και καθαροποιη-[σιν ταυτης της]
πρασεως ετοιμως εχω παρασχειν σοι την εγκει[μ]ε[ν]η[ν τιμην εν διπλω]
και ει τι δ' αν φανειης αναλωσας εις τε φιλοκαλιαν και ε[τεραν επιμελειαν]
και αυτα εν διπλη ποσοτητι μετα και του μηδεν ισχυειν κατα [των εμφερομενων]
τη παρουση πρασει αλλ' εφ ω αυτην και παν μερος α[υτ]η[ς] κ[υριαν ειναι και]

45. βεβαιαν και εννομον απανταχο˜ προφερομενην και εμ-
μ[.....]
46. εν δημοσιω αρχειω γεγενημενην και κατα νομους τ[ετε-
λειωμενην]
47. και εις τα προγεγραμμενα επερωτηθεις ωμολ[ογησα† Πιστωϊς]
48. υϊος Μηνα ελαχ/ διακ/ και προεστως του αγιου μ[ονασ-
τηριου αββα]
49. Κυρου αποπληρουντος το προσωπον του αγιο[υ.....]
50. και στοιχει μοι παντα τα εγγεγραμμενα [ως προκειται
.....]
51. γραψας χειρσι εμε απελυσα † Ηρακλειδη[ς.....]
52. μαρτυρω τη παρουση πρασει ακουσας παρα του θε[μενου
†..... υιος]
53. Μαρτυριου ελαχ/ πρεσβυτερος μαρτυρω τη παρ[ουση
πρασει ακουσας]
54. παρα του θεμενου † Οραμπς Ϊωσηφιου ελαχ/ διακ/ [του
αυτου]
55. μοναστηριου ακουσας παρα του θεμενου †† Διο[.....
μαρτυρω]
56. τη παρουση πρασει ακουσας παρα του θεμενου † Δ̣ι̣ο....
[μαρτυρω]
57. τη πρασει ακουσας παρ † Φλς Κ̣λ̣...ος πα[.....
μαρτυρω]
58. τη παρουση πρασει ακουσας παρα το˜ θεμενο˜ †
59. † δι εμου Κυριλλο˜ διακ/ και συναλλαγματογραφου
εγενετ[ο] †
60. † Φλς Παπνουθις υιος Βικτορος εκ μητρος Σοφια[ς
.....]
61. σα πρασει παντα τα εγγεγραμμενα ως προ[κειται]

Notes on No. 3.

1. Cf. No. 1, l. 17 sqq. αμα δε επωμοσαμεθα προς δε της αγιας και ομοουσιου τριαδα και νικην και διαμονην ..... Φλ'λ' Ηρακλειου κ.τ.λ.

2. Cf. No. 1, ll. 21 and 22. Zacharias, see l. 24 below. This papyrus corresponds to line 24 onwards of No. 1, and, from line 19 onwards, to No. 2. Hence most of the lacunae can be filled up.

6. Perhaps something more has been lost at the end of the line, but it is quite possible that παρα was so written as to fill up the space.

7. απο is unnecessary, but it is found when the phrase recurs in line 22.

8. Perhaps περι has been lost, or else some phrase like επι λαυρας; cf. No. 1, l. 28, εν τω υψωματι της πολεως επι λαυρας Τσιωθωρ.

9. ¯ at the end of a word after ο means υ. Cf. κατ¯ κατα in No. 1, l. 79.

10. κοινονιμιαιων: the correct spelling is κοινωνιμιαιων.

12. A Pistoïs is mentioned in No. 1, l. 69, etc., where he is said to be the father of John, the "reader" of the church at Apollonopolis. But as in line 34 of that papyrus he is spoken of as dead, and the papyrus was written in 618 near the beginning of Heraclius' reign, it is not likely that he is the person mentioned here.

13. Some word expressing "legacy" is required to fill up the lacuna.

15. Some word meaning "advantage" has been lost.

16. Possibly αυλης is the word required to fill up: there is only space for a few letters.

17. ανεωκται κ.τ.λ.: the construction as it stands is very abrupt: probably εις ην, referring to one of the ρυμαι δημοσιαι, has been accidentally omitted before ανεωκται. Cf. No. 1, l. 37.

21. γν: this is the ordinary sign for 3 obols, which is here transferred to the notation by solidi and κεράτια. It may possibly mean $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$, but until a parallel instance turns up, the point cannot be decided. Cf. Brit. Mus. No. 27, where F, the symbol for 4 obols, appears to be used for 4 κεράμια, and no. 99, line 21, where the symbol for $\frac{1}{4}$ obol is used for $\frac{1}{4}$ κεράτιον. At the end of the line αυτου or ειρημενου perhaps should be supplied before τριτου.

24. This is the only place where more than one buyer is spoken of. Cf. l. 23 του ωνουμενου, and l. 34 βεβαιωσω σοι.

27. Read κοινωνιμιαιων τοπων.

32. διακατοις: a slip for διακατοχοις.

34. [και αποσοβησω]. Cf. No. 1, l. 52, βεβαιουν τε και αποσοβησειν; but No. 2 in the parallel passage, line 7, has παση βεβαιωσει, which is also possible here.

36—7. The meaning is that the vendor pledges not only himself but his successors. But the confusion of cases, παντας τους ... οικονομησαντων, makes the restoration of line 36 very difficult.

45. εμμ: only the tail of the third letter is left, and the space would allow the interposition of another letter between it and εμ.

49. The phrase αποπληρουντος το προσωπον, which must agree with αββα Κυρου. is remarkable. Apparently it means "representing," the name of the saint following being lost.

51. χειρσι εμε must be for χερσι εμαις, as απελυσα is used intransitively. Cf. Brit. Mus. No. 77, etc.

53. This line seems to be written in the same handwriting as the previous line; but there is no mention of Heracleides being unable to write, and therefore requiring some one to write for him.

56. Δι̣ο̣ ...: this and the first part of the next line are written in a very large sprawling hand, in which the letters have hardly any characteristic shape. The proper name might be almost anything.

57. παρ: the formula breaks off abruptly, the witness having no doubt used up the space allotted to him. I have been unable to read the name after Φλς, the ink being faint, and the letters partly obscured by the extraordinary writing of the line above. It is not Κλαυδιος. πα may be the beginning of πατρος.

60—1. σα πρασει: so the papyrus. Unless σα is the termination of απελυσα or some such word, which would not suit the construction of line 62, σα must be a mistake for ση, i.e. [τη παρου]ση. In this case two different formulae are mixed up: (1) that of the vendor, which suits παντα τα εγγεγραμμενα ως προκειται, cf. line 50: (2) that of the witnesses, which suits τη παρουση πρασει. There is nothing to show what part Flavius Papnouthis took in the contract, nor why his signature was added after that of the scribe in line 59, which ought to close the document.

B. P. GRENFELL.

A COLLATION OF FROM TWO TO SIX MSS. OF THE REVELATION OF ST JOHN.

[THE following collations are referred to by Dr C. R. Gregory in his *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's Greek Testament (Vol. III. Pt 2, Leipzig 1890). The author of them, the late Reverend W. H. Simcox, is mentioned on p. 680 in the following terms: 'Mors Simcoxii praematura eo magis nobis lugenda est, quod Apocalypsis codices hoc consilio pro viribus conferebat, ut eorum familias definire posset.' Unfortunately no notes have been found of Mr Simcox's attempts at the genealogical classification of the MSS.: but New Testament scholars will welcome the publication of the collations themselves. References have been inserted to Dr Gregory's *Prolegomena*, where some account of the MSS. will be found; but with this exception the collation is printed as nearly as possible in the form in which the author left it. EDD.]

Cod. 68 [= Greg. 68; p. 680] Vaticanus 1904, here called *u*; collated throughout, i.e. for i. 11—ii. 20, iii. 16—vi. 9, vii. 17—ix. 5, xxi. 18[1]—xxii. 11.

72 [= Greg. 72; p. 680] Chisianus R. IV. 8, here called *v*; collated for i. 1—iii. 17 tolerably completely (but see ii. 20), iii. 18—iv. 11 hastily, and glanced at in v. 1, 9, 10, vi. 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, vii. 5—8, viii. 13, xxii. 14, 21.

[1] I am almost certain that this MS. does not contain xx. 1 sqq. Scholz's reputation for accuracy would stand higher than it does, if he had never made a worse mistake than to misread xx. 1 for xxi. in transcribing his notes.

73 [= Greg. 73; p. 680] Corsinianus 41. E. 37, here called *w*; collated throughout (but see ii. 20). Closely akin to 28. 79.

122 [= Greg. 151; p. 684] Chisianus R. v. 33, here called *x*; collated in the same places and way as *v*.

152 [= Greg. 152; p. 685] Vaticanus 370, here called *y*; collated throughout (but see ii. 20). Closely akin to 1. 12.

154 [= Greg. 154; p. 685] Vaticanus 1190, here called *z*; collated for i. 1—iv. 6 hastily.

I **1** *διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου*] *δι' ἀγγέλου* (sed superscr. $\overset{\text{ς}}{\tau}$) *w* **2** *τοῦ Θεοῦ*] Om. *w* pr. m., *αὐτοῦ τοῦ θῦ z* *τε*] Om. *vwxz* Post *εἶδε* vel *εἶδεν* + *καὶ ἄτινά εἰσι καὶ ἅτινα χρὴ γενέσθαι v*: eadem + *μετὰ ταῦτα* (quae re vera verba Andreae videntur esse) *wyz* **3** + *οἱ* ante *τηροῦντες v* + *ἐστι* post *ἐγγύς x* **4** *τοῦ* (ante *ὁ ὢν*)] *θῦ x*, om. *vwyz*, sed in *w* suppletum est in margine. *y* superscriptum habet *θῦ* $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$ $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ — *καὶ* ante *ὁ ἐρχ. y*, sed a m. recenti est suppletum *ἅ ἐστιν*] Ita *z* et, ut credo, *vy*. Sed *ἃ* tantum *x*, *τῶν w* (sed volgatum est in margine) *αὐτοῦ*] *τοῦ θεοῦ w* **5** *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$ $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$ *v* — *ἐκ w* x* — *ὁ* ante *ἄρχων y*, sed prima fortasse manus supplevit *ἀγαπήσαντι*] *ἀγαπῶντι x* *λούσαντι*] *λύσαντι vwy*, — *καὶ λ*[*ο*]*ύσαντι ἡμᾶς z* (cf. Is. xxxviii. 17) *ἀπὸ*] *ἐκ vwy ἁμαρτιῶν*] *ἀνομιῶν v* **6** *ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖς καὶ*] *ἡμᾶσ βασιλείαν*: *z*, *ἡμῖν βασιλείαν x* + *καὶ* ante *αὐτῶι y*, sed deletum est — *τῶν αἰώνων wx* **7** *ὄψεται*] *ὄψονται y* — *αὐτὸν* (post *ὄψεται*) *v* — *ἐπ' αὐτὸν v* **8** *Α...Ω*] *ἄλφα...ω̄ wxz*, *ᾱ...ω̄ y*. De *v* non notavi — *ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος x* *ὁ Κύριος*] $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ *ὁ θ̄ς̄ vxyz*, $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ *ὁ θεὸσ w* *...ὁ ἦν. καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενοσ ὁ παντ. y* — *ὁ* ante *παντ. w* **9** + *ὁ* ante *Ἰω. w* — *καὶ* ante *ἀδελφὸσ xy* — *ἐν τῇ* ante *βασιλ. w* *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (post *ὑπομ.*)] *ἐν χῶ ἰῦ x* *τῇ καλουμένῃ*] *καὶ ἐν τῆι y* — *διὰ* ante *τὴν w* — *Χριστοῦ* (in fine versus) *w** **10** *ἐγενάμην y** *ὀπίσω μου φωνὴν*] *φωνὴν ὀπίσω μου x* **11** — *Ἐγὼ...ἔσχατος. καί*, *wxz*: sed — *ὁ* tantum ante *πρῶτος* et ante *ἔσχατος v* *Ὃ*] *ἃ v* *ταῖς ἐκκλ. ταῖς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ*] *ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις vwxyz*

εἰς Θυάτειρα] ἐν θυατείροις *v*, εἰσ θυατήρασ *y* σάρδησ *y** φιλαδελφίαν *vwy* λαοδίκιαν *v* *u* incipit δίκειαν· καὶ ἐ **12** + ἐκεῖ post ἐπέστρ. *x* ἐλάλησε] ἐλάλησεν *y*, ἐλάλη *v*, ἐλάλει *uwz* **13** τῶν ἑπτὰ λυχνιῶν] τῶν λυχνιῶν *wy*, τῶν ἑπτὰ λυχνιῶν τῶν χρυσῶν *u* υἱῷ] υἱὸν *ux*, υἱὸν in υἱω mutatum *v* πρὸς] ἐν *u* μαστοῖς] μαζοῖσ *wz* **14** λευκαὶ] λευκαὶ καὶ *v*, et puncto inter duo verba inserto *u* ὡσεὶ] ὡσ *u* Post ἔριον punctum habet *y*, + καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ *x* — ὡς ante φλὸξ *w* **15** πόδαὶς αὐτοῦ ὅμοιη χαλκῶ λϊβάνω *v*. Sed ejusmodi errores plerumque non notavi **16** ἔχων] εἶχεν *u*, κρατῶν ἔχων *y* αὐτοῦ χειρὶ] αὐτοῦ tantum *v*, χειρὶ αὐτοῦ *uwyz* — ὁ ante ἥλιος *w* **17** ἔπεσα] ἔπεσον *vw* πρὸς] ἐπὶ *v* ἐπέθηκε] ἔθηκε *x*, ἔθηκεν *u* τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ χεῖρα] τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τὴν δ. *z*, at τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ tantum *ux* — μοι *uwxyz* **18** — τῶν αἰώνων *x*; in *y* ea excurrunt in marginem — ἀμήν *vxy* ᾅδου καὶ τοῦ θαν.] θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου *uxz* **19** + οὖν post γράψον *uwy* γίνεσθαι] γενέσθαι *vwz* **20** ὧν] οὓς *v*, οὗσ *y* αἱ ἑπτὰ λυχνίαι ἃς εἶδες, ἑπτὰ] — ἃς εἶδες *u*, — αἱ *v*; λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ *x* (non repetito ἑπτὰ).

II **1** — τῷ ἀγγέλῳ *w* Ἐφεσίνης] ἐν ἐφέσω *uwxy* (ἐν ἐφε est in rasura) *z*: ἐφεσίων *v* + κϲ ante ὁ κρατῶν *u* + χειρὶ post δεξιᾶ *u* ἐν μέσῳ] ἐπὶ *v*, omittit *y*, sed ubi debuit esse superscriptum est ἐπὶ τὰ vel τὰς **2** — σου post κόπον *wz* βαστάξαι *vy* ἐπειράσω] ἐπείρασασ *uy*, ἐπέ (tum in altero versu) ραστασας *v* φασκ. εἶναι ἀποστόλους] λέγοντασ ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλουσ εἶναι *uvwxyz* αὐτοὺς] τοὺς *w* **3** ἐβάστ. καὶ ὑπ. ἔχεις, καὶ] ὑπομονὴν ἔχεισ καὶ ἐβάστασασ *ux*, — καὶ post ἔχεισ tantum *w*; ἐβάπτισασ· (-πτησας *v*) καὶ ὑπ. ἔχεις, omisso καὶ, *vy*, ἐβάστ. καὶ διὰ τὸ ὄν. μου ὑπ. ἔχεις *z* κεκοπίακας καὶ οὐ κέκμηκας] καὶ κεκοπιακασ (σ in κ mutato) *y*, καὶ κεκοπίακες *v*, καὶ οὐκ ἐκοπίασασ *uwxz* **4** Ἀλλ'] ἀλλὰ *uxz* ἔχω] ἔχων *w*. Mox idem pro πρώτην scribit αι˜ Hνι, et similiter α̃ⁿ in v. 8 **5** πόθεν] ὅθεν *v* ἐκπέπτ.] πέπτωκας *ux*, μνημόνευε...[ἐκ]πέπτωκας omittit *w* τάχει] ταχὺ *uvwy*, nec certum habeo de *xz* aliter esse μὴ (ante μετανοήσῃς) in *y* primo omissum erat, sed a pr. ut credo m. insertum **7** οὖς] νοῦν *v* νικῶντι] νικόντι *vw* hic et v. 17 — μέσῳ *x*

τοῦ παραδείσου] τῷ παραδείσῳ *x*, τῷ παραδείσῳ *y* (ϐ superscr. a m. altera) + μου post Θεοῦ *uxz* **8** – καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ *x* ἐκκλησίας Σμυρναίων] σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίασ *w*, ἐν σμύρνη ἐκκλησίασ *uxyz*, ἐσμύρνη ἐκκλησίασ *v* ὁ ante ἔσχατος in *y* videtur post reliqua scripta in versum insertum fuisse ἔζησεν] ἔζησε πρῶτος *w* (ex commentario in textum irrepsit) **9** – τὴν ante πτωχείαν *wy* πτωχείαν] πενίαν *v* πλούσιος δὲ] ἀλλὰ πλούσιοσ *uvwxyz* + ἐκ post βλασφημίαν *vx*, + σου ἐκ *u*. Certum habeo ἐκ in ceteris deesse Ἰουδ. εἶναι ἑαυτούς] ἑαυτοὺς ἰϐδαίϐσ εἶναι *w* **10** ἃ] ὃ *w* πάσχειν] παθεῖν *x* + δὴ post ἰδοὺ *xz* βαλεῖν] βαλλεῖν *x*, βάλλειν *uvy* ἐξ ὑμῶν ὁ διάϐ.] ἐξ ὑμῶν ὁ δ. *y* (notas a pr. m. credo adpositas: sed ὁ videtur postea esse insertum, ut in v. 8): ὁ διάβολοσ ἐξ ὑμῶν *uwxz* ἔξετε] ἔξεται *v*, ἔχεται *y* **11** τοῦ θαν. τοῦ δευτ.] τϐ ϛ′ϐ θανάτ· *w* (ubi videlicet spatii curam habet scriba) **13** – τὸ ante ὄνομά *u* οὐκ (ante ἠρνήσω) in οὐτ' (ut videtur) est correctum a m. altera in *y* – καὶ ante ἐν ταῖσ ἡμέραισ *uvwxyz* ἀντεῖπας *x*, ἀντείπας per compendium *u* et, ut videtur, *y** + καὶ ante ὁ μάρτυσ μου *u* – ὁ bis, ante μάρτυς et ante πιστὸς, *v* – μου *v* + ὅτι πᾶσ μάρτυσ πιστὸσ (profecto ex commentario) *y* – ὃς *u* κατ. ὁ Σ.] ὁ σατανᾶσ κατοικεῖ *uvwxyz* **14** – Ἀλλ' ἔχω...ἔχεις ἐκεῖ *z* (nempe a κατοικεῖ ad ἐκεῖ transiverat oculus) ἀλλὰ non eliso ἀ habent *vx* ἐν τῷ Βαλὰκ] τὸν βαλὰκ *uwxz*, βαλαὰκ *v*, ἐν τῶι βαλαὰμ τὸν βαλαακ *y* βαλεῖν] βαλειν sine accentu *v*, βαλλεῖν (sed uno versu βαλ, altero λεῖν) *w* + καὶ ante φαγεῖν *ux* **15** – τῶν *u* ὃ μισῶ] ὁμοίωσ *uxz* et per compendium *w*; ὁμοίωσ ὃ μϊσῶ *y*, ἣν μισῶ *v* **16** + οὖν post μετανόησον *ux* (ceteri om.) **17** φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ μάννα] τοῦ μάννα φαγεῖν *u*; φαγ. ἀπὸ τοῦ μ. τοῦ κεκρ. καὶ hic om. *x*, sed post λαμβάνων addit καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου ἔγνω] οἶδεν *uvwyz*. De *x* non pro certo cognovi **18** θυατήροις *vwy*, θυατείρη *x* – αὐτοῦ prius *y* **19** καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν διακ. καὶ τὴν πίστιν] Omnino om. *x*, καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν διακονίαν *uwyz*, καὶ τὴν διακονίαν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν *v* – καὶ ante τὰ ἔσχατα *uvwxz*, sed *y* habere credo **20** Ἀλλ'] ἀλλὰ *ux* ὀλίγα] πολλὰ *w*, om.

uxz, — ὀλίγα ὅτι ἐᾷς *v*, — σου ὀλίγα ὅτι ἐᾷς *y* ἐᾷς] ἀφεὶς *uwz*, neque aliter credo *x* + σου post γυναῖκα *uwz*, nihil addunt *vxy* ἰεζάβελ *uwxy*, ἰεζάβελ *vz* τὴν λέγουσαν] ἣ λέγει *uwxz* In *u* folium finitur ad ἑαυ, et desunt omnia usque ad iii. 16 διδάσκειν καὶ πλανᾶσθαι] καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾶ τοὺσ *xz*, καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾶ *vwy*. Hos tres etiam credo τοὺς habere, ad id non notavi εἰδ. φαγ.] φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα *wxyz*. *v* volgatum habere credo 21 μετανοήσῃ] -σει *z* ἐκ τῆς π. αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐ μετεν.] καὶ οὐ θέλει (θέλη *x*) μετανοῆσαι ἐκ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς *wxz*, — καὶ οὐ μετενόησεν *y* 22 — ἐγὼ *vwxyz* αὐτῶν] αὐτῆς *vxz* 23 ἀπεκτενῶ *w* 24 + ἐγὼ ante λέγω *x* καὶ (ante λοιποῖς)] τοῖς *vwxyz* θυατήροις *vwy* καὶ οἵτινες] ὅσοι *w*, at οἵτινες (sine καὶ) *vxy* βαθέα *x* βαλῶ] βάλλω *vwxy* ὑμᾶς] ἡμᾶς *x* 25 ἂν ἥξω] ἀνοίξω *x* 27 ὡς] καὶ *v* συντρίβεται] συντρίβησεται *wx* παρὰ] ἀπὸ *w* 28 ἀστέραν *x*, προϊὸν *v*.

III 1 + ἑπτὰ ante πνεύματα *vwxyz* — τὸ *vwxyz* ὅτι] καὶ *x* ζεῖσ *y**, ἦν *v* 2 στήριξον] στήριξων *y**, στήρισον *xz*, τήρησον *w* τὰ λοιπὰ] τὰ μικρὰ *v* μέλλει] ἔμελλον *wy*, ἤμελες *v*, μ̈ελεσ *x*, ἔμελλες *z* ἀποθανεῖν] ἀποβάλλειν *vx*, ἀποβαλεῖν *z* + μου post θῦ *wxz* 3 — καὶ ἤκουσας, καὶ τήρει *x*, at — καὶ ante τήρει tantum *v* — ἐπί σε primo *wy* 4 Ἔχεις ὀλίγα] Ἀλλ' ἔχεις ὀλίγα *wxz*, Ἀλλ ὀλίγα ἔχεις *v*, καὶ (hoc deletum est) ἔχεις ὀλίγα *y* — καὶ ante ἐν Σάρδ. *wxz* ἃ] ὁῖ *v* 5 — ὁ νικῶν *y* οὗτος] οὕτως *z* ἐξομολ.] ὁμολογήσω *vwy* 7 φιλαδελφία *y*, φιλαδελφέιας *v* (quamvis ἐν praecesserit) κλείδα] κλεῖν *xz* κλείει (prius)] κλείσει *v*, κλείων *w* κλείει (alterum)] κλείων *vy*, ὁ κλείων *w* ἀνοίγει] Ita *v*, ἀνοίγων *w*. In *xz* autem totum locum ita legimus: ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείσει αὐτὴν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀνοίγων· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίξει 8 ἠνεωγμένην *y* καὶ (ante οὐδεὶς)] ἣν *wxy* + οὐ ante μικρὰν *w* 9 δίδωμι] δίδωμαί σοι *v*; est rasura trium fere litterarum inter δί et δωμι in *y* ἰδοὺ (alterum)] καὶ *vy* ἥξωσι] ἥξουσι *wy** προσκυνήσουσιν *w*, *y* vero -ωσιν ex correctura pro -ουσιν habere hic non tam certum est 10 πυρασμοῦ (et multa ejusmodi) *v* τῆς οἰκ. ὅλης] τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην *v* 11 — Ἰδοὺ *vxy* 12 — καὶ ἔξω...πόλεως τοῦ Θεοῦ

μου *x* ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν] ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶ *vw* ἡ καταβαίνουσα] ἦ καταβαίνει *xz* **14** ἐκκλησίας Λαοδικέων] ἐν λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησίας *wy*, ἐν λαοδικείας *v* καὶ (ante ἀληθινὸς)] ὁ *w* ἀρχὴ] ἀπαρχὴ *w* κτίσεως] κτήσεως *y* **15** + ὅτι ante σου *y*, sed erasum est εἶης] ἦς *vwxy*, εἶσ *y*; qui quidem ante ὄφελον κ.τ.λ. habet οὕτως ὅτι χλιαρὸς εἶ. καὶ οὔτε ζεστὸσ. οὐτε ψυχρόσ: ex confusione, ut videtur, de textus et commentarii limitibus **16** — οὕτως ὅτι χλιαρὸς εἶ καὶ οὔτε ζεστὸς *v*, ita ut legamus ὄφελον ψυχρὸς ἦς ἢ ζεστὸς οὖτε ψυχρὸς Μέλλω σε ἐμέσαι ψυχρὸς οὔτε ζεστός] ζεστὸσ, οὔτε ψυχρός. *wxz*. De *vy* vide supra In *u* folium incipit μέλλω σε αἰμέσαι **17** λέγεις] λέγει *v* — ὅτι ante πλούσιος *y* — καὶ ante οὐδενὸς *v* οὐδενὸς] οὐδὲν *y* εἶδας *vx* + ὁ ante ἐλεεινὸσ *uxz* — παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ *ux*, post χρυσίον ponit *z*. Huc usque *vx* integri collati sunt **18** περιβάλῃ] περιβάλλην *v* et ut videtur *w* καλλούριον ἔγχρισον] Ita *z* et ut credo *y*: κολύριον ἔγχρισον *v*, κολλύριον ἵνα ἐγχρίσῃ *ux*, κολλύριον ἔχρισε (fortasse pro ἔγχρισαι) *w* **19** ζήλωσον] Ita *z*, ζήλευε *ux* — οὖν *w* **20** In *w* post μετανόησον e commentario in textum irrepsit βαβαὶ τῆς φιλανίας πόσῃ ἀγαθότητι ὁ ἔγχοσ (lege ἔλεγχοσ) κέκραται καὶ κρούω] κρούω̄ (i.e. κρούων) *x* ἀκούσει *y* + καὶ ante εἰσελεύσ. *uxz* εἰσελεύσωμαι *vy* **21** καθῆσαι et ἐκάθησα *w* — ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου *w*.

IV **1** ἀνεωγμένη *uw* — ἡ ante πρώτη *vw* λέγουσα] Ita *z*, λέγων *ux* **2** τοῦ θρόνου] τὸν θρόνον *ux* **3** — καὶ ὁ καθ. ἦν *uvwxyz* ἰάσπιδι] ἰάσπηδι *w*, ἰασπίδος *v* σαρδίνῳ] σαρδίω *uwxz*, σαρδίου *v* Ἶρις] ἱερεῖς *w* κυκλόθεν] κύκλωθεν (ultima syllaba compendio scripta) *w* ὅμοιος] ὅμιος *v*, ὁμοίως *x*, ὁμοία *u* σμαραγδίνῳ] σμαραγδίνου *v*, ὁρασϊ σμαραγδίνων *x* **4** — Καὶ ante κυκλ. *x* κυκλόθεν] Ita *u*, κύκλωθεν *v*, κύκλῳ *w* θρόνοι] Ita *vwxyz*, θρόνους *u* εἴκ. καὶ τέσσ.] εἰκοσι τέσσαρες *x*, κδ *uvwyz* — καὶ ante ἐπὶ τοὺς θρ. *x* — εἶδον *uwxy*; habet *z*: de *v* vide infra — τοὺς *wy*; habet *z* et procul dubio *ux* εἴκ. καὶ τέσσ.] κδ *uwyz*: de *x* nihil notavi. εἶδον τοὺς...καθημένους omittit *v* — ἐν *w*: habent *vxz* — ἔσχον *uvwxyz* **5** — Καὶ ἐκ *y** βρονταὶ καὶ φωναί] βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ *y*, φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ *uvwxz* + αὐτοῦ post θρόνου *uvwxz*. De *z* ultra hunc locum nihil cogni-

tum habeo *αἵ*] Ita *vx*, *ἃ y* *εἰσι τὰ*] *εἰσὶ y*, *εἰσιν uvx* **6** + *ὡσ* ante *θάλασσα uwx* *τέσσαρα ζῶα*] *δ̄ ζῶα y*, *ζῶα τέσσαρα w* *ὀφθαλμῶν*] *ὀφθαλμοῖς w* — *καὶ* ante *ὄπισθεν v* **7** *τὸ ζ. τὸ πρῶτον*] *τὸ πρῶτον ζῶον w* *ἔχον*] Ita *x*, sed *ἔχων y* — *τὸ* ante *πρόσωπον ux* *ὡς ἄνθρ.*] *ἀνθρώπου ux* — *ζῶον* post *τέταρτον u* *πετομένῳ uvx* **8** + *τὰ* ante *τέσσαρα uw*, sed non *vxy*: *y* habet *δ* *καθ' ἑαυτὸ*] *καθὲν αὐτῶν ἐστὼσ u*, *καθ' ἓν αὐτῶν wy*, *καθὲν* tantum *vx* *εἶχον*] *ἔχον uvx*, *ἔχων y*, *ἔχει w* Punctum post *κυκλόθεν* habent *uy* *γέμοντα*] Ita *v*, *γέμουσιν wxy* *ὀφθαλμῶν*] *ὀφθαλμοὺσ w* et per compendium *v* *λεγοντα*] *λεγον x*, *λέγοντες uvy* et per compendium *w* *ἅγιοσ* novies *u*, sexies (per compendium scriptum) *x* — *ὁ Θεὸς w* — *ὁ* ante *ἐρχόμενοσ y** ut videtur **9** *δώσουσι*] *δῶσωσι y*, *δῶσι uvx* + *τέσσαρα* ante *ζῶα u* **10** *εἴκ. καὶ τέσσ.*] *εἰκοσιτέσσαρεσ uvx*, *κδ wy* — *ἐνώπιον τοῦ καθ....τῶν αἰώνων y* *προσκυνοῦσι*] *προσκυνήσουσι uvwx* *βάλλουσι*] Ita *w* et ut credo *y*, sed *βαλοῦσι uvx* **11** *κύριε*] *κε̄ ὁ θ̄ς ἡμῶν vwy*, *ὁ κύριοσ καὶ ὁ θσ ἡμῶν ὁ ἅγιοσ u* et pluribus compendiis *x* *εἰσὶ*] *ἦσαν x*. Huc usque *vx* aliquatenus collati sunt.

V **1** — *καὶ* ante *εἶδον w* *ὄπισθεν*] *ὅπισθεν y*, qui punctum habet ante *ἔσωθεν*, non post *ὅπισθεν*: *ἔξωθεν uvw* *ζ'* pro *ἑπτὰ w* **2** + *ἐν* ante *φωνῇ u* *ἐστιν ἄξ.*] *ἄξιοσ* tantum *y*, *ἄξιόσ ἐστιν uw* **3** *ἐδύνατο u* + *ἄνω* post *οὐρανῷ u* *οὐδὲ*] *οὔτε* ter *u* **4** — *ἐγὼ y* *πολλὰ*] *πολὺ uw*, *πολοὶ y* — *καὶ ἀναγνῶναι uw* **5** — *ὢν uw*: habet *y* (*ὁ* et altero versu *ὁ ὢν*) *Δαβίδ*] *δᾶδ y*, *δαυὶδ u*, *τοῦ δᾶ̈δ w* *ἀνοῖξαι*] *ὁ ἀνοίγων u* — *λῦσαι uwy* — *ἑπτὰ w* **6** — *καὶ ἰδοὺ wy*: habet *u* *δ* pro *τεσσάρων y* + *καὶ ἐν μεσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων* post *ζώων u*; sed punctis haec *διττογραφία* notata est *ἑστηκὼς* pro *-κὸς y** *ζ̄* pro *ἑπτὰ* bis *y* — *καὶ* ante *ὀφλασμοὺσ* (sic pr. m.) *y* *οἵ*] *ἃ u* — *ἑπτὰ* tertium *y* *τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεύματα*] *πνάτα τοῦ θῦ wy* *τὰ ἀπεστ.*] *ἀποστελλόμενα u* **7** — *τὸ βιβλίον uwy* **8** *εἰκοσιτέσσ.*] *κδ̄ wy* *ἔπεσαν y** *κιθάρας*] *κιθάραν uwy* *εἰσιν αἱ*] *εἰσὶ u* **9** *ἄδουσι uwy* (*-σι* bis in fine et in initio versuum *y**), quamvis in *wy* vocalis subsequatur *ᾠδὴν καινὴν*] *καινὴν ᾠδὴν u* *τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς*] Ita *w*: *ἡμᾶσ τῶ θεῶ u*, — *τῷ Θεῷ v* **10** *ἡμᾶς*] *αὐτοὺσ uvwxy* *βασιλεύσομεν*] *βασι-*

λεύσουσιν *uvw*, βασιλεύ^{σ}ουσιν *y*, βασιλεύουσιν *x* **11** + ὡς post ἤκουσα *u* κυκλόθεν] κύκλω *uy* + αὐτοῦ post θρόνου *w* + καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων *uwy* **12** + τὸν ante πλοῦτον *u* **13** κτῆσμα vel fortasse κτῆμα *y** − τῷ ante οὐρ. *w* ἐν τῇ γῇ] ἐπὶ τῆσ γῆσ *uy*, ἐπί γῆς *w* − ἅ ἐστι *w*, ὅσα ἐστὶ. *u* πάντα] καὶ πάντασ *w*: *y* volgatum habere credo + καὶ ante ἤκουσα *u* λέγοντας] λεγόντων *u* τοῦ θρόνου] τῶ θρόνω *u*: in *y* dubitaveris utrum του θρονου an τον θρονον scriptum sit, nisi quod articulus accentum circumflexum habet **14** δ˜^{α} pro τέσσαρα *y* + τὸ ante ἀμήν *u* (non *y*) − εἰκοσιτέσσ. *uwy* ἔπεσον *wy* − ζῶντι... αἰώνων *uwy*.

VI **1** − μίαν *y*, duae primae litterae erasae (ita ut nunc ′αν tantum legeris) in *u* + ἑπτὰ ante σφραγίδων *u* δ^{ων} pro τεσσάρων *y* ὡς φ. βρ. ᾽Ερχου] ὡς φωνὴ βροντῆς ἔρχου *u*, sed ἔρχου ὡς φωνὴ βροντῆς:— *w* − καὶ βλέπε *wy*, sed καὶ ἴδε *uvx* **2** αὐτῷ (prius)] αὐτὸν *uwy* **3** τὴν δευτ. σφρ.] τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν δευτέραν *uy* − καὶ βλέπε *vwxy* **4** + καὶ εἶδον ante καὶ ἐξῆλθεν *u* πυρὸσ *uwy* αὐτῷ (primum)] αὐτῶ *uw* ἀπὸ] ἐκ *uw*, sed omnino omittit *y* − καὶ ante ἵνα *w* σφάξωσι] σφάξωσιν *uy*, κατασφάξωσι *w* **5** ὅτε ἦν....ἤκουσα] ἤκουσα ἀνεωγμένησ τῆσ γ′ σφραγῖδ^{ος} *w* τρίτην σφρ.] σφραγῖδα τὴν τρίτην *u*, σφράγιδα τὴν τρίτην *y* τρίτου] γ′ *w*, Γ^{ου} *y* − καὶ βλέπε *vwy*, ἴδε pro βλέπε *ux* − Καὶ εἶδον *ux*: *x* scribit ἔρχου· καὶ ἴδε καὶ ἰδοὺ, et in ἴδε est rasura αὐτῷ] αὐτὸν *uwy* **6** + ὡς ante φωνὴν *y* τεσσ. ζώων] δ′ ζώον *y** **7** δ˜ pro τετάρτην *w* − φωνὴν *u* δ′^{8} pro τετάρτου *wy* λέγουσαν] λέγοντος *u* − καὶ βλέπε *wy*, ἴδε pro βλέπε *uvx* **8** − Καὶ εἶδον *u* − αὐτοῦ prius *y* ἀκ. μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ] ἠκολούθει αὐτῶ *u* αὐτοῖς] αὐτῶ *u* ἀποκτ. ἐπὶ τὸ τέτ. τῆς γῆς] ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον τῆσ γῆσ. ἀποκτεῖναι *u*, ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον μέρος τῆσ γῆσ ἀποκτεῖναι *w*. *y* habet idem quod *u*, nisi quod est una littera erasa post τέταρτον **9** In *u* folium terminatur in verbis καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν, et desunt reliqua usque ad vii 17 ε′ pro πέμπτην *w*, ε^{την} *y* + τῶν ἀνων ante τῶν ἐσφαγμένον *y* **10** − ὁ ante ἀληθινός *w*, supra versum habet *y* **11** ἐδόθησαν...λευκαί] ἐδόθη ἡ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν στολῇ λευκή *w*,

ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἑκάστῳ στολὴ λευκὴ *y* et (nisi quod ἐδώθη αὐτῆς) *v*, ἐδόθη αὐτοὶς στολὴ λευκὴ *x* ἀναπαύσωνται] ἀναπαύσονται *w* πληρώσονται] πληρώσουσι *w*, πληρώσωσι *xy*, πλϋρῶσοση ut videtur (= πληρώσωσι) *v* ἀποκτείνεσθαι] ἀποκτένεσθαι *w*, ἀποκτάνεσθαι vel -κταίνεσθαι *y** **12** + καὶ ante ὅτε ἤνοιξαι *y* — ἰδοὺ *wy* + ὅλη post σελήνη *w* **13** ἔπεσον *w* et ex correctura *y* βάλλει] ἀποβάλλει *w* — μεγάλου *y** + ὁ ante οὐρ. *wy* ἀπεχ. ὡς βιβ. εἰλ.] εἰλείσετο (vel εἰλισσόμε͂ν) ὡς βιβλίον *y** εἰλισσόμενον] εἰλισσόμενος *w* **15** πλ. καὶ οἱ χιλ.] χιλίαρχοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι *w* δυνατοί] ἰσχυροί *w* — πᾶς ante ἐλεύθ. *w* **16** πέσατε *w*.

VII **1** εἶδον τέσσ.] ἴδον δ̄ *y* + καὶ ante κρατοῦντας *w* δ″ pro τέσσαρας ante ἀνέμους *w* **2** ἀναβάντα] ἀναβαίνοντα *wy* σφραγῖδα] σφραγίδας *y* **3** ἄχρις οὗ σφραγ.] ἄχρι σφραγίσωμεν *y*, ἄχρις ἂν σφραγίσωμεν *w* **4** τὸν ἀρ.] τῶν ἀριθμῶν *y* **5** Post ἰούδα, δώδεκα plene scriptum habent *wx*: sed postea undecies ιβ′ *w*. Cum ῥουβὶμ, δώδεκα ponit *x*, postea ιβ′: *vy* semper δώδεκα. Ῥουβήν] ῥουβῖμ vel -βὶμ *wx* et ut videtur *y*, ῥουβὴμ *v* **5—8** Λ γὰδ usque ad ἰωσὴφ novies deest ἐσφραγισμένοι in *wy*, in *v* decies deest, a γαδ usque ad βεν., in *x* legimus post ἰούδα δώδεκα χιλιαδες (ες compendio) ἐσφραγισμέναι, tum deest ἐσφρ. semper usque ad βενϊαμὶν. Praeterea desunt Γὰδ, Ἀσὴρ et Νεφθαλμ sed in margine suppleti sunt + καὶ ante ἐκ φ. ἀσὴρ et ante ἐκ φ. ζαβουλῶν *y* μανασῆ simplici σ *y* **9** — αὐτὸν *w* ἑστῶτες] ἑστῶτας *w* περιβεβλημένοι] περιβεβλημένους *w*, -νοις *y* φοίνικες] φοίνικας *w* **10** κράζοντες] κράζουσι *y*, κράζουσι κραυγῇ καὶ *w* καθ. ...ἡμῶν] τῷ θῷ ἡμῶν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου *w*, τῶι θῶ ἡμῶν ℵ. τῶ καθημένω ἐπὶ τῶ θρόνωι *y* **11** ἑστήκεσαν] εἱστήκεισαν *y*, εἱστήκησαν *w* ἔπεσαν *y* πρόσωπον] τὰ πρόσωπα *w* — ἡ ante εὐχαρ. *y** **12** Desunt omnia post prius ἀμήν in *w* **13** στολὰς τὰς λευκὰς] λευκὰς στολὰς, *w* **14** + μου post κέ *wy* εἶπέ μοι] εἶπεν *w* στολὰς αὐτῶν alterum] αὐτὰς *wy* **15** + καὶ ante διὰ τοῦτο *w* σκηνώσει] κατασκηνώσει *w* **16** πεινάσῶσιν et διψήσῶιν *y* — ἔτι alterum *y* — ἥλιος οὐδὲ πᾶν καῦμα inter duas paginas *w*. Hic prope in commentario est οὐδὲ μὴ πέσῃ...πᾶν καῦμα, sed id in textu non nisi casu omissum videtur. Idem postea bis terve

factum est: vid. ad xv. 1, xvi. 7 **17** Incipit *u* verbis *ὅτι το ἀρνίον τὸ ἀναμέσον*] *ἀνὰ μέσον u, ἄνω μέσον w ποιμανεῖ*] *ποιμαίνει u ὁδηγήσει*] *ὁδηγεῖ u ζώσας*] *ζωῆσ uw ἀπὸ*] *ἐκ u.*

VIII **1** $\bar{\xi}$ pro *ἑβδόμην y* + *καὶ* ante *ἐγένετο u* **2** + *τοῦ θρόνου* ante *τοῦ θεοῦ w* **3** *τὸ θυσιαστήριον*] *τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου uw λιβανωτὸν*] *λιβατὸν w δώσῃ*] *δώσει uw* **5** *τὸ*] *τὸν uy* et compendio *w αὐτὸ*] *αὐτὸν uw, αὐτῶν y* (qui paullo ante *λϊβανωτὸν* habet, et *ἐγέμησεν*). Nescio an *ἐκ* in *u* erasum sit *ἐγένοντο*] *ἐγένετο u φ. καὶ βρ.*] *βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ u* **6** $\bar{\zeta}$ pro *ἑπτὰ* bis *y* + *οἱ* ante *ἔχοντες w ἑτοίμασαν y*; qui plerumque *σάλπηγγασ, ἐσάλπησεν* et similia scribit **7** − *ἄγγελος u μεμιγμένα*] *μεμιγμένων* (i.e. *-μένον*) *y* + *ἐν* ante *αἵματι uw ἐβλήθη*] *ἐβλήθησαν u* + *καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατεκάγη* post *γῆν w*, et (nisi quod *κατεκαίει* pr. m., *-κάη* corrector) *y. καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατεκάη* habet etiam *u*, sed hic *κ. τ. τρ. τῶν δένδρων κατ.* omittit *κατεκάη* alterum] *κάη* tantum *u** **8** + *μέροσ* post *τρίτον u* **9** + *μέρος* post *τρίτον* prius *u* − *τῶν* ante *ἐν τῇ θαλ. w*, − *τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλ. y διεφθάρη*] *διεφθάρησαν wy* **10** In *y* est rasura trium fere litterarum ante *τῶν ποταμῶν* + *τῶν* ante *ὑδάτων uwy* **11** + *ὁ* ante *ἄψ. uw γίνεται*] Ita *y*: *ἐγένετο uw* + *τῶν ὑδάτων* post *τρίτον uwy* + *τῶν* ante *ἀνθρ. uwy* **12** *ἵνα σκοτισθῇ*] *καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη u* In *u* folium terminatur in *καὶ ἡ ἡ*, sed alibi invenitur in quo continuatur *μέρα μὴ φαίνῃ*] *ἵνα μὴ φαίνῃ w, οὐκ ἔφαινεν u* **13** *ἀγγέλου*] Ita *vwy*: *ἀετοῦ ux πετομένου uw μεσουρανίσματι y* + *τρὶσ* post *μεγάλῃ w οὐαὶ* bis tantum *y τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν*] *τοὺσ κατοικοῦντασ u*

IX **2** *ὡς*] *ὥσπερ u μεγάλης*] *καιομένησ u* In *y* est rasura inter *ὁ* et *ἥλιος* **2, 3** − *καπνοῦ τοῦ φρέατος, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ u** **4** *ἐρρέθη αὐταῖς*] *ἐῤῥήθη αὐτοῖσ u* − *μόνους uw* − *τοῦ Θεοῦ wy τῶ*$^{\text{N}}$ *μετώπων η*: N in *τῶν* omiserat m. pr. − *αὐτῶν wy* **5** *αὐταῖς*] *αὐτοῖσ y βασανισθῶσι*] Ita (nisi quod *-σιν*) *u*: *βασανισθήσονται y* Post *μῆνας πέντε*, ut credo, deficit *u*: sed non locum satis clare indicavi *ὅταν παίσῃ*] *ὡς ὅταν πέσῃ w* **6** *οὐχ εὑρήσουσιν*] *οὐ μὴ εὕρωσιν wy φεύξεται*] *φεύγει y* **7** *ὡσ* ante *στέφανοι* in *y* supra

versum scriptum est, sed ut credo a pr. m. **8** $-\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu$ *w* **10** $-\tilde{\eta}\nu$ *wy* $\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\circ\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$] $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\circ\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ *w* **11** $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$] $\dot{\epsilon}\pi'$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ *uy* Imperitus quidam in *y* supra $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ (sic) $\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\circ\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\eta}\sigma$ scripsit $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\circ\nu\alpha$ et alibi ejusdemmodi alia, quae passim exscribere haud placet $'\text{A}\beta\alpha\delta\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$] $\grave{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$ vel $\grave{\alpha}\beta\alpha\alpha\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$, ut in nota ad marginem, *y*: $\grave{\alpha}\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\nu$ *w* $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$] $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ *w* Supra $\grave{\alpha}\pi\circ\lambda\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$ superscriptum est $\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\nu$ in *y* **12** $\grave{\alpha}\pi\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$] $\pi\alpha\rho\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ *w* $-\check{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ *y* **13** $-\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\nu$ *w*: habet *y* $+\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\circ}\tau\circ\sigma$ post $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau$. *w* **14** ς' pro $\check{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\tilde{\omega}$ *y**, ut videtur $\tilde{\circ}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\chi\epsilon$] $\acute{\circ}$ $\check{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu$ *wy* Uterque ante haec interpungit, ita ut scribae "Qui tubam habes" intellexisse videntur $\bar{\delta}$ pro $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$ et $-\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ hic et in v. 15 *y* **15** $\acute{\eta}\tau\circ\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\circ\iota$] $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\circ\iota\mu$. *y** ut videtur, $\pi\rho\circ\eta\tau\circ\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\circ\iota$ *w* $+\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ ante $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$ *w* $+\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\circ\sigma$ post $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\circ\nu$ *w* **16** $+\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ ante $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau$. *wy* $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\circ$ $\mu\upsilon\rho$.] $\delta\iota\sigma\mu\upsilon\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\sigma$ *y* $-\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ ante $\check{\eta}\kappa\circ\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ *wy*. In *y* vero aliquid scriptum erat quod nunc celat $'\text{H}\kappa$: non credo tamen $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ unquam adfuisse **17** $-\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ post $\sigma\tau\circ\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ *y** **18** $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\grave{\circ}$] $\acute{\alpha}\pi\grave{\circ}$ *y*, $\grave{\alpha}\pi\grave{\circ}$ *w* $+\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\tilde{\omega}\nu$ post $\tau\rho\iota\tilde{\omega}\nu$ *w* $\grave{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ in *y* tres ultimas litteras erasas habet, ita ut $\grave{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta$ restet. $-\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\circ\tilde{\upsilon}\ldots\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\pi\circ\rho\epsilon\upsilon\circ\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\circ\upsilon$ *y**: id addidere duae manus (ut saepe factum est) altera supra versum, altera in margine $-\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ ante $\tau\circ\tilde{\upsilon}$ $\kappa\alpha\pi\nu\circ\tilde{\upsilon}$ *w*: habet autem ante $\tau\circ\tilde{\upsilon}$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\circ\upsilon$ $\tau\circ\tilde{\upsilon}$ $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\circ\rho$.] $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\pi\circ\rho\epsilon\upsilon\circ\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$ *w* (sed $\omega\nu$ bis per compendium) **19** $\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho\ldots\epsilon\grave{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu$] $\acute{\eta}$ $\gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho$ $\grave{\epsilon}\xi\circ\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\nu$, $\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\sigma\tau\acute{\circ}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\grave{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ $\circ\dot{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ *w*: $'\text{H}$ (hoc in litura) $\gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho$ $\grave{\epsilon}\xi\circ\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$. $\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}\iota$ $\sigma\tau\acute{\circ}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\grave{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\grave{\iota}\nu$. *y* **20** $\circ\ddot{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon$ (ante $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu$.)] $\circ\dot{\upsilon}$ *w* $+\tau\grave{\alpha}$ ante $\epsilon\ddot{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda\alpha$ *wy* $-\tau\grave{\alpha}$ ante $\lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\iota\nu\alpha$ *w* $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$] $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ *wy* **21** $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\mu\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$] $\kappa\lambda\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ *w*

X **1** $-\check{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\circ\nu$ *w* $\check{\iota}\rho\iota\varsigma$] $\check{\iota}\rho\iota\nu$ *w* $+\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\circ\tilde{\upsilon}$ post $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$ *y* $-\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\tau\grave{\circ}$ $\pi\rho\acute{\circ}\sigma\omega\pi\circ\nu\ldots\pi\acute{\circ}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\circ\tilde{\upsilon}$ *y** **2** $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\alpha\rho$.] $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\circ\nu$ *w* $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda$.] $\tau\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$ $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ *w* $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\gamma\tilde{\eta}\nu$] $\tau\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$ $\gamma\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$ *wy* **3** $-\check{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\alpha\xi\epsilon\nu\ldots\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\acute{\circ}\tau\epsilon$ *y** $\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\grave{\epsilon}\pi\tau\grave{\alpha}$] ζ (omisso $\alpha\acute{\iota}$) *y* **4** $\acute{\circ}\tau\epsilon$] $\acute{\circ}\sigma\alpha$ *w* $-\tau\grave{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\phi\omega\nu\grave{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\grave{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ *wy* $\check{\eta}\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\circ\nu$ *y* $-\mu\circ\iota$ *wy* ζ pro $\grave{\epsilon}\pi\tau\grave{\alpha}$ *y* $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$ $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\eta\varsigma$] $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$ $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota\sigma$ *y* et per compendia *w* **5** $+\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\delta\epsilon\xi\iota\grave{\alpha}\nu$ post $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\circ\tilde{\upsilon}$ *w* **6** $-\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\alpha\grave{\iota}\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\nu$ *y* $-\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\gamma\tilde{\eta}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\eta}$ *y*, at *w* post $\circ\dot{\upsilon}\rho\alpha$. habet $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\gamma\tilde{\eta}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\circ\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ (sequitur $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda$.

κ.τ.λ.) οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι] οὐκέτι ἔσται *wy* **7** Ἀλλ᾽ eliso ὰ *wy* ζ́ pro ἑβδ. *y* μέλλῃ] μέλλει *w* ὡς] ὅ *w* εὐηγγέλισε] In *y* est unius litterae rasura in εὐχηγγέλισε: εὐηγγελίσατο *w* τοῖς ἑαυτ....προφήταις] τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους προφήτας *y* ubi τοὺς addiderunt duae manus, quarum una fortasse prima: τοὺς αὐτοῦ δούλους τοὺς προφήτας sine dubio, quamvis multis compendiis, *w* **8** λαλοῦσα] λαλοῦσαν *y* λεγουσα] λέγουσαν *y* βιβλαρ.] βιβλιδάριον *w* ἀνεωγμένον *w* + τοῦ ante ἀγγέλου *wy* **9** βιβλαρείδιον *y*, βιβλιδάριον *w* **11** + καὶ post προφητ. *w* + ἐπὶ ante ἔθνεσι + ἐπὶ ante γλώσσαις

XI **1** λέγων] καὶ ἡ φωνὴ λέγουσα *w* Ἔγειραι] ἔγειρε *wy* **2** ἔσωθεν] ἔξωθεν *w* ἔξω] ἔξωθεν *wy* μετρήσῃς] μετρήσεισ *w* μβ′ pro τεσσ. δύο *wy* **3** προφητεύσωσιν *y** ᾱσ́ ξ̄ pro χιλ. διακ. ἑξ. *w* περιβεβλημένοι] περιβεβλημένους *w* **4** — ἐλαῖαι καὶ *y* + αἱ ante δύο λυχ. *w* + ἐπὶ ante τῆς γῆς *w* **5** θέλῃ] θέλει *wy* αὐτοὺς θέλῃ ἀδικ.] αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι θέλει *w*: θέλει etiam *y*, qui ante haec ἤτις pro εἴτις habet a pr. m. **6** βρέχῃ...προφητ.] ὑετὸς βρέχῃ τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς προφητείασ αὐτῶν *wy* — αὐτὰ *y* + ἐν ante πάσῃ *wy* **7** ὅταν] ὅτε *y** πόλεμον μετ᾽ αὐτῶν] μετ᾽ αὐτῶν πόλεμον *w* — καὶ ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτοὺς *y*: sed ἀποκτείνει pro -κτενεῖ *w* **8** + ἐάσει post τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν *w* + τῆς ante πόλεως *wy* + ἄταφα post μεγάλησ *w* ἡμῶν] αὐτῶν *wy* **9** βλέψ.] βλέπουσιν *wy* — καὶ ante ἥμισυ *y* πτώματα alterum] σώματα *wy**, sed prima fortasse manus πτώματα correxit ἀφήσ.] ἀφίουσϊ *w*, ἀφίουσιν *y* μνήματα] μνῆμ̃α *wy* **10** ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (prius)] τὴν γῆν *w* χαροῦσιν] χαίρουσιν *wy* ἐπ᾽] ἐν *w* εὐφρανθ.] εὐφραίνονται *wy* πέμψουσιν] πέμψωσιν *y*, πέμπουσιν *w* **11** — τὰς *y** ἡμ. καὶ ἥμ.] καὶ ἥμισυ ἡμέρασ *w* — ἐκ τοῦ θῦ *y**, καὶ pro ἐκ *w* ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς] εἰσ αὐτοὺσ *y*: sed αὐτοῖσ *y**, omisso fortasse εἰς. αὐτοῖς sine dubio *w* μέγασ ἔπεσεν] μέγασ ἐπέπεσεν *y*, ἐπέπεσε μέγασ *w* **12** ἤκουσαν φωνὴν μεγάλην] ἤκουσα φωνῆσ μεγάλησ *wy* λέγουσαν] λεγούσησ *wy* — τῇ *w* **13** ὥρᾳ] ἡμέρᾳ *w* ἐγένοντο, καὶ] γενόμενοι *w* **14** ἀπῆλθεν] παρῆλθεν *w* ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ τρ.] ἡ τρίτη οὐαὶ *w* **15** ἕβδοσ pro -ομος *w*

'Εγένοντο...τοῦ Χριστοῦ *αὐτοῦ*] *ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ* Κῦ *ἡμῶν* Ἰῦ Χῦ *w*. *y* volgatum habet nisi quod *– αἱ*: sunt autem rasurae trium fortasse litterarum ante et post *ἡμῶν* *βασιλεύσει*] *βασιλεύει w* **16** *κδ΄* pro *εἴκ. καὶ τέσσ. wy* *– οἱ* ante *ἐνώπιον y* *ἔπεσον w* et corr. *y* **17** + *ἡμῶν* post *θσ΄ w* *– καὶ ὁ ἐρχ. y* **18** Bis scriptum est, et in calce unius paginae et in vertice alterius, *καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου καὶ ο καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν*: et hoc quidem non incuria, sed quia ita cum commentario cohaeret. Confer tamen ad vii. 16 *– καὶ* ante *τοῖς φοβ. wy* *– καὶ* ante *διαφθεῖραι w* **19** *φ. καὶ βρ.*] *βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ w*

XII **1** *– ἡ y* *ὑπὸ κάτω* duobus accentibus *w* + *δι'* ante *ἀστέρων w* *δώδεκα*] *ιβ΄ w*, *δεκαδύο y* **3** Est in *y* unius litterae rasura post *ἄλλο* *πυρὸσ* simplici *ρ wy* *ζ* pro *ἑπτὰ* priore *y* *κέρατα δέκα*] *δέκα κέρατα w* *διαδ. ἑπτ.*] *ἑπτὰ διαδήματα w*, *διαδίματα* (in pr. m.) tantum *y* **4** *– τοῦ οὐρανοῦ y* *ἔστηκεν y**, *κατεφάγῃ w* **5** *ἄρρενα*] *ἄρσενα y* *– ἐν y* *– αὐτῆς w* + *πρὸς* ante *τὸν θρόνον w* **6** + *ἐκεῖ τὸν* post *ἔχει w* *ἀπὸ*] *ὑπὸ w* *ᾳσξ*: pro *χιλ. διακ. ἑξ. w* **7** In *y* ante *αὐτοῦ* prius, tertia manus *μετ'* inseruit. Et hoc quidem fieri potest ut ita legendum censuerit: sed id rem in dubium vocat, quod hic et alibi (vid. ad ix. 11) haec manus insulsa quaedam superscripsit: cum quibus hic totus locus legeretur *ὁ ἀρχαγ. μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐπολέμησαν κατὰ*] *πολεμῆσαι μετὰ wy*: in *y* autem est rasura ante *πολεμ.*, ubi *τοῦ* potuit scriptum esse **8** *οὔτε*] *οὐδὲ w*. In *y* est unius vel duarum litterarum rasura post *τόποσ εὑρ. αὐτ.*] *αὐτῶν εὑρέθη w* *– ἔτι wy** **9** *ὁ* ante *ἀρχαῖοσ* est supra versum in *y*, sed ut credo a pr. m. *– ὁ* ante *σατανᾶσ w*, quamvis in commentario sit *εἰ δε μετὰ τοῦ ἄρθρου κεῖται ὁ σατανᾶσ κ.τ.λ.* In *y* est *διάβολοσ*. *Καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶσ – μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν w*, *– μετ' αὐτοῦ y* **10** Ante *μεγάλην* in *y* est erasum *ἐκ τοῦ* *λέγουσαν ἐν τῷ οὐρ.*] *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγουσαν wy* *κατεβλ.*] *ἐβλήθη w* *αὐτῶν*] *αὐτοὺς y* et per compendium *w* *– ἡμῶν* ante *ἡμέρασ wy* **11** *διὰ* (ante *τὸν λόγον*)] *μετὰ w* **12** *– τοῖς κατοικοῦσι wy* *ὑμᾶς*] *ἡμᾶσ.* *ὁ y* **13** *ἥτις*] *εἴτις w* **14** + *αἱ* ante *δύο wy* *πέτηται*] *πέταται w*, *πέτιται* ut videtur *y**, *πέτεται* vel

fortasse *πέταται* y^c — *εἰς τὴν ἔρημον* y, agnoscit autem comm. *τρέφηται* y^c **15** *ἔβαλεν*] *ἔβαλλεν* w *ὀπίσω ...αὐτοῦ*] *ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικός* wy In y ita conturbatus est foliorum ordo, ut hic inter *ποταμὸν* et *ἵνα* legatur xiv. 18—xv. 1 *ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς...διαγωγὴν* (quod ibi in commentario est). Et per reliquum librum singula ex quoque quaternione folia prave ordinata sunt: sed nihil deest *ταύτην*] *αὐτὴν* w **17** *τοῦ Ἰησ. Χρ.*] Nil nisi *ἰῦ*:— wy

XIII **1** *ἔχον...δέκα*] *ἔχον κέρατα δέκα καὶ κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ* w, *ἔχων κέρατα δέκα καὶ κεφαλὰς ξ′* y **2** — *τὸ* y^* sed addidit prima fortasse manus *ἦν ὅμοιον*] — *ἦν* y, *ὅμοιον ἦν* w *ἄρκου* wy^* + *δύναμιν* ante *ἐξουσίαν* w, sed punctis notatum est **3** — *εἶδον* wy + *ἐκ* ante *τῶν κεφ.* w **4** *τὸν δράκοντα*] *τῷ δράκοντι* wy *ὃς ἔδωκεν*] *ὅτι ἔδωκε* (*-κεν* y^*) *τὴν* wy *τῷ θηρίῳ*] *τὸ θηρίον* w — *καὶ προσεκ. τὸ θηρίον* y + *καὶ* ante *τίς* wy **5** In y est aliquid erasum ante *λαλοῦν* *βλασφημίας*] *βλάσφημα* wy *μβ′* pro *τεσσ. δύο* w **7** — *Καὶ ἐδ. αὐτῷ πόλ....αὐτοὺς* y: neque ea videtur agnoscere commentarius *πόλεμον ποιῆσαι*] *ποιῆσαι πόλεμον* w + *καὶ λαὸν* post *φυλὴν* w **8** *αὐτῷ*] *αὐτὸν* w *τὰ ὀνόματα*] *τὸ ὄνομα* y *τῇ βίβλῳ*] *τῷ βιβλίῳ* wy + *τοῦ* ante *ἐσφαγμ.* wy **10** — *αἰχμ. συνάγει* w, + *εἰσ* ante *αἰχμ.* prius et mox — *εἰς αἰχμ. ὑπάγει* y *ἀποκτενεῖ*] *ἀποκτείνει* w *αὐτὸν*] *αὐτὴν* w **11** — *ὡς δράκων* w: quod vix casu factum credo (quamvis ea agnoscat commentarius) quia versus non expletus est nisi per :~~:~:~ **12** *τοῦ*] *αὐτοῦ* w *κατ. ἐν αὐτῇ*] *ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντες* wy **13** *καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ*] *ἐν πλάνῃ ποιῇ πῦρ* w *καταβ. ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*] *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν* w **14** *ὃ*] *ὅσ* wy **15** — *ἵνα καὶ λαλήσῃ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ θηρίου* w *ποιήσῃ*] *ποιήσει* w *τὴν εἰκόνα*] *τῇ εἰκόνι* w — *ἵνα* wy **16** *δώσῃ*] *δῶσιν* y, *δώσωσιν* w — *αὐτῶν* post *μετώπων* w **17** — *καὶ* ante *ἵνα μήτις* w *δύνηται*] *δύναται* wy^* *ὁ* ante *ἔχων* in y nescio utrum a pr. m. sit necne — *ἢ* ante *τὸ ὄνομα* wy **18** — *τὸν* ante *νοῦν* w + *ἐστιν* ante *χξ*$^{\text{ϛ}}$: — wy

XIV **1** + *τὸ* ante *ἀρνίον* w *ἑστηκὸς*] *ἑστὸς* w, *ἕστως* y *ἑκ. τεσσ. τέσσ.*] $\rho\bar{\mu}\delta$ w, $\rho\bar{\mu}\delta$ y. Idem quoque in v. 3 + *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ* post *ἔχουσαι* wy **2** — *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ...καὶ ὡς φωνὴν* y, at — *καὶ ὡς φ. βρ. μεγ.* w + *ὡς* ante *κιθαρῳδῶν*

w **4** *– εἰσιν* ante *οἱ ἀκολ. y* *ὅπου*] *ὅποι w* **5** *δόλος*] *ψεῦδος wy* *εἰσιν...Θεοῦ*] *εἰσι:~:~* tantum *w*, *εἰσίν. y* **6** *– ἄλλον y* *πετόμενον w* *εὐαγγελίσαι*] *ἐρχόμενον εὐαγγελίσασθαι w* *+ τοὺσ καθημένουσ* ante *τοὺς κατοικ. y* **7** *λέγοντα*] *λέγων wy* *τῷ ποιήσαντι*] *αὐτόν, τὸν ποιήσαντα w* *θάλασσαν*] *τὴν θάλασσαν w*, *θαλάσσασ y* **8** *+ δεύτερος* post *ἄγγελος wy* *– ἔπεσε w*: *y* alterum *ἔπεσεν* erasum habet *– ἡ πόλις wy* *– ὅτι w* *+ ἧς* post *αὐτῆς w* *πάντα ἔθνη*] *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη y*, *τὰ ἔθνη πάντα w* **9** *τρίτος ἄγγελος*] *ἄλλοσ ἄγγελοσ τρίτοσ w*, *ἄλλοσ ἄγγελοσ* tantum *y* *τὸ θ. πρ.*] *προσκυνεῖ τὸ θηρίον wy* **10** In *y* est rasura post *θῡ τῶν ἁγ. ἀγγ.*] *ἀγγέλων ἁγίων y* **11** *ἀναβ....αἰώνων*] *εἰσ αἰῶνα αἰῶνοσ ἀναβαίνει w*, *εἰσ αἰῶνα αἰωνων ἀναβαίνει y* *τὸ θηρίον*] *τῶι θηρίον y**, *τῶι θηρίω y^c^* **12** *Ὧδε* (prius)] *Ἡδὲ ἡ w* (sed mox *ὧδε*) *+ ἡ* ante *ὑπομ. y* *– τοῦ Θεοῦ y* *+ χριστοῦ* post *Ἰῦ w* **13** *ἀπάρτι*] *. ἀπὸ ἄρτι.* (n. b. puncta) *w* *ἀναπαύσωνται*] *ἀναπαύσονται y* *– αὐτῶν* post *ἔργα y* **14** *νεφέλην*] *κεφαλὴν w* *καθήμ....νίῷ*] *καθήμενον ὅμοιον υἱὸν w* *ἔχων*] *ἔχοντα w* *τῆς κεφ.*] *τὴν κεφαλὴν w* *ὀξύ*] *ὀξύν w* **15** *ναοῦ*] *οὐρανοῦ wy* *μεγ. φ.*] *φωνῇ μεγάλῃ wy* *τῆς νεφ.*] *τὴν νεφέλην w* *– τὸ δρ. σου καὶ θέρισον w* *ἦλθέ σοι*] *ἦλθέν σου y*, *ἦλθεν* tantum *w* *– τοῦ wy* **16** *ἐθερίσθη*] *ἐξηράνθη w* Venimus iterum ad locum (cf. ad xii. 15) ubi conturbatus est in *y* foliorum ordo. Nempe ita legendus est codex: fol. 208, 200, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 209, 210, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 217, 218, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 225, 226, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 233, 234, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 241, 248, 249, 250. Habet autem fol. 210 notam ΚΗ et 218 ΚΘ: ceterae ejusmodi notae praescissae sunt **18** *βότρυας*] *βότρυσ w* *+ τῆς ἀμπέλου* post *βότρ. wy* **19** *τὴν* ante *ληνὸν*] *τὸν y^c^* *τὴν μεγάλην*] *τὸν μέγαν y.* *ν* in *μέγαν* vix legi potest, sed non credo consulto erasum fuisse **20** *ἀπὸ...ἑξα.*] *ᾱχ̄* pro *χιλ. ἑξα. y*, *ἀποσαδίων ᾱχ̄ w*

XV **1** *ἑ* pro *ἑπτὰ* bis *y* *πληγὰς ἑπτὰ*] *ἑπτὰ πληγὰς w* *– ἐσχάτας...τοῦ Θεοῦ* (inter duas paginas) *w*. Cf. ad vii. 16. Duobus versibus paene integris opus esset ut haec adderentur **2** *y^c^* bis *ὑαλ.* in *ὑελ.* volt mutare *+ καὶ* ante *ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ*

wy **3** *μωϋσέωσ y.* Statim + *τοῦ wy* *ἁγίων*] *ἐθνῶν* *y* et per compendium *w* **4** − *σε wy* *δοξάσῃ*] *δοξάσει wy* *τὰ* ante *ἔθνη* in *y* omissum erat, sed a pr. credo m. supra versum scriptum **5** − *ἰδοὺ wy* **6** ‘$\bar{\zeta}$ pro *ἑπτὰ* bis *y*. Spiritum et accentum (quos jam abhinc plerumque adesse notavi, sed non in priore libri parte) non a pr. m. esse credo + *οἱ* ante *ἔχοντεσ* *y* − *καὶ* ante *λαμπρὸν wy* *περὶ*] *ἐπὶ w*, omnino omittit *y* **7** − *ἓν wy* ‘$\bar{\zeta}$ pro *ἑπτὰ* bis *y* − *τοῦ* ante *θυμοῦ w* − *τοῦ* *Θεοῦ* inter duas paginas, ut vii. 16, xv. 1. Sed hic fieri certe potuit, ut *θυμοῦ τοῦ ζῶντοσ κ.τ.λ.* consulto scriptum fuerit. **8** $\bar{\zeta}$ pro *ἑπτὰ* priore *y* − *ἑπτὰ* ante *ἀγγέλων wy*. In *y* est supra versum rasura, ubi fieri potest ut $\bar{\zeta}$ insertum fuerit: sed nunc superscriptum est tantum *ἅγιοι*, ab inepto illo qui in xii. **7** *ἅγιοι* et *οἱ πονηροὶ* supra vocem *ἄγγελοι* intulit.

XVI **1** in *w* incipit sine puncto, nedum paragrapho $\bar{\zeta}$ pro *ἑπτά* *y* − *καὶ* ante *ἐκχέατε* (ita *w*) vel *-ετε* (*y*) *wy* − *τοῦ Θεοῦ y* *εἰς*] *ἐπὶ w* **2** + *ἄγγελος* post *πρῶτος w* *τοὺς τῇ εἰ. αὐτοῦ πρ.*] *προσκυνοῦντασ τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ*: *w*, *προσκ.* *τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ*:— *y* **3** − *ὡς wy* + *τὰ* post *ἀπέθανεν y*, sed *ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· ἀπέθανεν*: pro· *ἀπ. ἐν τῇ θ. w* **4** − *εἰς* ante *τὰς πηγὰς w* **5** − *Κύριε wy* − *καὶ* ante *ὁ ὅσιος wy* **6** *γάρ εἰσι*] *εἰσίν*: ~~ tantum *wy* **7** − *ἄλλου ἐκ w*, − *ἄλλου* tantum *y* **8** $\bar{\delta}$ pro *τέταρτος y* **9** *καῦμα μέγα*] *καύματι μεγάλω w* + *τὴν* ante *ἐξουσίαν y* **10** − *πέμπτος y* *ἐσκοτωμένη*] *σκοτισμένη w* *ἐμασῶντο w* **11** − *ἐκ* ante *τῶν ἑλκῶν y* **12** ‘$\bar{\varsigma}^{\text{oc}}$ pro *ἕκτος y* − *τὸν* ante *εὐφρ. y* − *αὐτοῦ y* *ἀνατ$\overset{\lambda}{\text{ο}}$* tantum *y*: et quamquam nota quaedam sit super *ἡλίου*, intelligere nequeas utrum *-λῆς* an *-λῶν* voluerit **13** + *καὶ ἐκ του δρακοντ$^{\text{os}}$* post *δράκοντος w* *πνεύματα*] *πνα y**, *τ$^{\text{a}}$* addit *y$^{\text{c}}$* − *ὅμ. βατρ. y*: *ἀκάθαρτα*:— est in fine versus. In commentario Andreae *y* habet *ἐοικότα βατρ.* Pro *ὅμ. βατρ.* habet *ὡς βάτραχοι ἐκπορευθέντα w* **14** *δαιμόνων*] Ita per compendium *w* *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*] Ita *w*. Credo *y* etiam his duobus locis cum Stephano consentire − *τῆς γῆς καὶ w* − *καὶ τῆς* (ante *οἰκουμένης*) *y* + *τὸν* ante *πόλεμον w* **15** *αὐτοῦ*] *ἑαυτοῦ y* *βλέπωσι*] *βλέπουσι wy* **16** ’Αρ*μαγεδδών*] *ἁρμαγεδών*:— *y*, *μαγεδών*:— — *w* **17** $\bar{\zeta}$ pro *ἕβδο-*

μος *y* ἀπὸ prius] ἐκ *y* — τοῦ ναοῦ *wy* **18** φ. καὶ βρ. καὶ ἀστρ.] ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταί *w*, ἀστραπαὶ καὶ βρονταὶ tantum *y*, quamvis ibi quoque Andreae commentarius eundem habeat ordinem quem *w* — οἱ ante ἄνθρωποι *wy* **19** ἔπεσαν *wy** ἐμνή- habet *w* in fine versus, neque additum est -σθη + τοῦ ante δοῦναι *w* **20** + καὶ post ὄρη *w* **21** + ἡ ante μεγάλη *w* ταλαντιαία] ταλαντία *w*, procul dubio per incuriam ἐπὶ τοὺς] πρὸς (compendio) *w* + ὅτι μεγάλησ ante ὅτι μεγάλη ἐστὶν *w* αὐτῆς] αὕτη *w*.

XVII **1** — ἐκ *w* ζ̄ pro ἑπτὰ bis *y* τῶν ὑδ. τῶν π.] ὑδάτων πολλῶν *wy* **2** ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου...οἱ κατ. τὴν γῆν.] οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆσ *wy* **3** με] μοι *w* ἔχον] ἔχων *y**. Mox ζ pro ἑπτὰ idem **4** ἡ (ante περιβεβ.)] ἣν *wy* πορφύρᾳ καὶ κοκκίνῳ, καὶ κεχρ.] πορφύραν καὶ κόκκινον κεχρυσωμένη *wy* ἀκαθάρτητος] τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς *w*, τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τὰ τῆσ *y* **6** — καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν *w* (ita ut stet τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων) — Ἰησοῦ *y* **7** + καὶ ante τοῦ ἔχοντος *wy* ζ pro ἑπτὰ *y* **8** + τὸ ante Θηρίον *w*, + καὶ τὸ *y* ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον τῆς] ἐν βίβλῳ *w* βλέποντες] βλεποντων *w* (per compendium) *y* ὅ, τι] ὅτι *w* καίπερ ἐστίν.] καὶ πάρεστιν *y*, ϗ πάρεστι *w* **9** ὧδε] Ὁ δὲ (non nisi per incuriam, cum Ὁ δὲ...σοφίαν totum expleat paragraphum) ὄρη εἰσὶν ἑπτὰ] ἑπτὰ (ζ *y*) ὄρη εἰσὶν *wy* **9**, **10** κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν. καὶ] κάθηται. καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ *w* **10** Novo paragrapho repetitum est Καὶ βασιλεῖσ ἑπτά εἰσιν in *wy* — καὶ ante ὁ εἷς *wy* **12** *y* haesitasse videtur utrum ἀλλ' an plene ἀλλᵃ scribenda esset λαμβ. μετὰ τοῦ θ.] μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου λαμβάνουσιν *w* **13** ἑαυτῶν] αὐτῶν *wy* διαδιδώσουσιν] δώσουσιν *w*, διδόασιν *y* **14** + ἐστι post βασιλέων *w* καὶ (ante ἐκλ.)] ὅτι *y* ἐκλ. καὶ πιστοι.] πιστοὶ και ἐκλεκτοὶ *w* **16** ἐπὶ] καὶ *wy* μισήσουσι] μισοῦσι *w* ἐρημωμένην *wy* — καὶ γυμνὴν *y* κατακαύσ.] καύσουσιν *y* **17** In *y* est unius litterae rasura ante θσ̄ — αὐτῶν post βασιλείαν *w* τελεσθῇ τὰ ῥήματα] τελεσθήσονται οἱ λόγοι *wy*.

XVIII **1** + ἄλλον post εἶδον *y* **2** — ἐν *y* ἰσχύϊ, φωνῇ μεγάλῃ.] ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ *y*, sed ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ tantum *w* — καὶ φυλ. π. ὀρν. ἀκαθ. *wy*, ita ut καὶ μεμισημένου statim post

prius *ἀκαθάρτου* veniat **3** *τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ*] *τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ οἴνου wy* *πέπωκε*] *πεπότικε w* *στρήνους*] *στρήνου y* **4** — *ἐξ αὐτῆς ὁ y* — *καὶ* ante *ἵνα y* *ἵνα μὴ λάβητε ἐκ τῶν πλ. αὐτῆς*] *ἐκ τῶν πληγῶν αὐτῆσ ἵνα μὴ βλαβήτε w*: — *ἐκ τῶν πλ. αὐτῆς y* **5** *ἠκολούθησαν*] *ἐκολλήθησαν wy* **6** + *ὑμῖν* post *ἐκέρασε* (non *ἐκέρασεν*) *w* **7** — *καὶ πένθος y* *ὅτι*] *Διότι w, καὶ y* + *ὅτι* ante *κάθημαι w* **8** + *ὁ παντοκράτωρ* post *ὁ θσ̄ w* *κρίνων*] *κρίνασ y* **9** *κλαύσονται*] *κλαύσουσιν w* **10** *ἑστηκότες*] *στήκοντεσ w* — *ἐν w* **11** *κλαίουσι καὶ πενθ. ἐπ' αὐτῇ*] *κλ. καὶ π. ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺσ. y, κλαύσονται οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖσ w* **12** *καὶ* (ante *μαργ.*)] *ἢ y* *πορφύρας*] *πορφυροῦ wy* — *σηρικοῦ y* **13** + *καὶ ἄμωμον* post *κινάμωμον w* *θυμιάματα*] *θυμίαμα y* *μύρον*] *σμύρναν w* *ἵππων*] *ἵππον y**, ut videtur **14** *εὑρήσῃς*] *εὕρῃσ w* Inter vv. 14 et 15 textui inseruntur in *w* Andreae verba *οὔτε ψυχὰς ἀνῶν κ.τ.λ.* supra *ἔξεις ἀπόλαυσιν.* Error aliquatenus rubro notatus est, sed subsequitur sine puncto ante finem versus *οἱ ἔμποροι κ.τ.λ.* **16** — *καὶ λέγοντες y* *πορφυροῦν*] *πορφύραν y* — *καὶ* ante *κόκκινον w* — *καὶ* ante *κεχρ. y* *ἐρημώθη wy* **17** *ὁ ὅμιλος*] *πλέων w, πόλεων y* **17, 18** *ἔστησαν, καὶ*] *ἑστήκασι* (— *καὶ*) *w* **18** *ὁρῶντες*] *βλέποντες wy* **18, 19** — *Τίς ὁμοία...λέγοντες, w* **19** *ἐρημώθη wy*; praeterea *ἐρημώθη ὥρα* pro *ὥρᾳ ἠρημ. y* **20** + *καὶ οἱ* ante *ἀπόστολοι w* **21** In *y* est inter *λί θον* rasura trium litterarum *ὡς*] *ὡσεὶ w* **22** *σαλπιστῶν y* **23** — *καὶ φῶς λύχνου...ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι w* — *σοῦ* post *ἔμποροι w* *φαρμακία y* **24** *αἷμα*] *αἵματα y.*

XIX **1** *φωνὴν*] *ὡς φωνῆς w* — *μεγάλην wy* *λέγοντος*] *λεγόντων w, λεγόντον y* — *καὶ ἡ τιμὴ w* *Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ*] *τῶι θῶι y, τοῦ θῦ w* **2** *τὴν* (ante *πόρνην*) supra versum habet *y* **3** — *αὐτῆς y* *ἀναβαίνει*] *ἀνέβη w* **4** *πρεσβ....τέσσαρες*] *κδ̄ πρεσβύτεροι w*, sed *πρεσβ. οἱ κδ̄ y.* Mox *δ'* pro *τέσσαρα w* **5** *τὸν Θεὸν*] *τῷ θῷ wy** — *καὶ* ante *οἱ μικροὶ wy* **6** *λέγοντας*] *λεγόντων* (compendio) *w* *ἐβασ. Κύριος*] *ἐβασίλευσεν* (-*κς*) *y* + *ἡμῶν* post *θς̄ wy* **7** *χαίρωμεν καὶ ἀγαλ. καὶ δῶμεν*] *χαίρομεν καὶ ἀγαλλιῶμεν καὶ δώσωμεν w* et (nisi quod *ἀγαλιῶμεν* simplici λ) *y** *αὐτῷ*] *αὐτοῦ y* — *αὐτοῦ y* *ἑτοίμασεν y* **8** — *καὶ* ante *λαμ-*

πρὸν *wy* ἐστι τῶν ἁγίων] τῶν ἁγίων ἐστί. compendiis *w*, τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν. plene *y* **9** Μακάριοι οἱ] μακάριοί εἰσιν *w* In *y* est unius litterae (ν ut credo) rasura post τὸ — τοῦ γάμου *wy* **10** ἔπεσα *wy* προσκυνῆσαι] καὶ προσεκύνησα *w* μὴ in *y* bis scriptum erat, sed alterum deletum: mox καὶ τῶν quoque bis scriptum sed prius deletum + καὶ ante τῶν ἐχόντων *y* — τοῦ ante Ἰησοῦ bis *wy* **11** — καλούμενος *wy* κρίνει] κρινεῖ *w*: haesitavit *y* quem accentum poneret **12** — ὡς *wy* **14** ἐφ' ἵπποις λευκοῖς] ἔφιπποι πολλοὶ *w* ἐνδεδυμένοι] ἐνδεδυμένοισ *y* — καὶ ante καθαρὸν *w* **15** πατάσσῃ] πατάξῃ *wy* αὐτὸς π. αὐτοὺς] αὐτοὺσ ποιμανεῖ αὐτὸς *w* Post λῃνὸν in *y* est rasura trium fortasse litterarum **16** + αὐτοῦ post ἱμάτιον *y** — τὸ ante ὄνομα *wy* **17** — ἕνα *w* ἔκραξε] ἔκραζε *y* — λέγων *y* πετομένοις *w* + τῷ ante μεσουρ. *w* — καὶ συνάγεσθε *y*, at συνάχθητε (— καὶ) *w* τὸ] τὸν *w*, est rasura post τὸ in *y* **18** φάγηται *w***y* — καὶ σάρκας ἰσχ. *y* — πάντων *y* + τε post ἐλευθέρων *w* **20** μετὰ τούτου] μετ' αὐτοῦ *w* — ἐν οἷς ἐπλάν...τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ *w* (inter duas paginas) ἐβλήθησαν] βληθήσονται *y* **21** ἐκπορευ.] ἐξελθούσῃ *wy*.

XX **1** κλεῖδα] κλεῖν *w* **2** — τὸν ὄφιν *w* ἐστι διάβ. καὶ Σ.] ἐστιν ὁ διάβολοσ ἡ ὁ Σατανᾶσ *w* ᾳ pro χίλια *y*; idem quoque vv. 3, 4, 5, 7 **3** ἔκλεισεν αὐτὸν] ἔδησε *w*, ἔδησεν *y* τὰ ἔθνη ἔτι] ἔτι τὰ ἔθνη *w*, — ἔτι *y* — τὰ ante χίλια (vel ᾳ) *wy* **4** ἐκάθησαν *y** κρῖμα *wy* τῷ θηρίῳ] τὸ θηρίον *w* τὴν εἰκόνα] τῆι εἰκόνι *y* τὸ μέτωπον] τῶν μετώπων *w* + τοῦ ante χῦ *w* — τὰ *wy* **5** οἱ δὲ] Καὶ οἱ *wy* ἀνέζησαν ἕως] ἔζησαν ἄχρι *wy* τελεσθῇ] Ita *y*, τελεσθῶσι *w* **6** + καὶ ante μακάριοσ *w* **7** ὅταν] ὅτε *y* τελεσθῇ] παντελεσθῆ *w*, ἐτελέσθη *y* **8** + καὶ ante τὸν Γὼγ *w* — τὸν ante Μαγώγ *wy* + καὶ ante συναγ. *wy* συναγαγεῖν] συναγεῖν *w* **9** — ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ *w*: *y* habet ἐκ ante τοῦ θῦ et ἀπὸ ante τοῦ οὐνοῦ **10** + καὶ ante ἐβλήθη *w* + τοῦ ante θείου *w* + καὶ ante τὸ θηρίον *w* — εἰς τοὺς αἰ. τῶν αἰώνων *y* **11** αὐτοῦ] αὐτὸν *wy* — ὁ ante οὐρανὸς *w* **12** μικροὺς καὶ μεγάλους] τοὺς μεγάλουσ καὶ τοὺσ μικροὺσ *wy* Θεοῦ] θρόνου *w* ἠνεῴχ· καὶ βιβ. ἄλλο ἠν.] ἠνοίχθησαν· καὶ ἄλλο

βιβλίον ἠνοίχθη w: ἀνεώχθησαν· καὶ ἄλλο βιβλίον ἠνοίχθη y **13** τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ νεκρ.] τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ w τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς νεκρούς.] τοῖς ἐν αὐτοῖς νεκροὺς. y, sed τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς w **14** – οὗτός...θάνατος y: sed pro ἐστιν ὁ δεύτ. θάν., ὁ θάνατος δεύτερός ἐστιν ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρὸς w **15** ἐν τῇ βιβ. τῆς ζ. γεγρ.] γεγραμμένος ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς ζωῆς ζωῆς w.

XXI **1** + καὶ ante οὐκ ἔστιν w **2** – ἐγὼ Ἰω. wy εἶδον post καινὴν wy ἡ ἡτοιμασμένην y **3** – Θεὸς αὐτῶν y **4** – ὁ Θεὸς w οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι] οὐκ ἔτι ἔσαι w: in y οὐκ est supra versum ὅτι τὰ] τὰ γὰρ w **5** καθ. ἐπὶ τοῦ θρ.] ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ καθήμενος w, καθ. ἐπὶ τῶι θρόνωι y καινὰ πάντα ποιῶ] καινοποιῶ πάντα w, καινὰ πᾶ̄ι ὧ̄ πάντα y. **6** Γέγονε. ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ A] Γέγονα ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα w, γέγοναι τὸ ἄλφα y Mox τὸ ω̄ι. y **7** πάντα] ταῦτα wy αὐτῷ] αὐτῶν wy αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι ὁ υἱός.] αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι υἱοί: – – – – wy: sed in y μοι ex correctura pro μαι, ut videtur **8** δειλοῖς δὲ] τοῖς δὲ δειλοῖς w et (nisi quod δηλοῖς) y – καὶ ante ἐβδελ. wy φαρμακεῦσι] φαρμακοῖς w, φαρμακεῖς y δεύτ. θάν.] θάνατος δεύτερος w, (ἐστιν) ὁ ē^{os} θάνατος y **9** ἦλθε πρός με] ἦλθεν wy ζ′ pro ἑπτὰ w, ἑπτὰ alterum om. y, sed ζ̄ suprascriptum est τὰς γεμούσας τῶν] τῶν γεμόντων wy ‘ζ̄ pro ἑπτὰ tertio y **10** – καὶ ante ὑψηλόν y* , τὴν ἁγίαν] καὶ ἁγίαν wy **11** – καὶ ante ὁ φώστηρ w In y est rasura ante λίθωι prius – ὡς λίθῳ y **12** ἔχουσάν τε] ἔχουσά τε y, ἔχουσα tantum w ἔχουσαν] ἔχουσα y, καὶ ἔχουσα w – καὶ ante ὀνόματα w ῑβ̄ pro δώδεκα y. Mox πυλεῶισιν y* sed ε erasum est τῶν υἱῶν] τοῦ w **13** Ἀπ'] Ἀπὸ w + καὶ ante ἀπὸ δυσμῶν w **14** ἔχον] ἔχων y ῑβ̄ pro δώδεκα primo y ἐν αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα τῶν δώδεκα] ἐπ' αὐτῶν ῑβ̄ ὀνόματα· τῶν δώδεκα y et (nisi quod iterum ῑε̄) w **16** – τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν wy – ὅσον y – καὶ w + ἐν ante τῷ καλάμῳ wy ῑ pro δώδεκα y: sequitur rasura + αὐτῆς post alterum quoque μῆκος w. In y punctum est post hoc τὸ μῆκος, non ante **17** ῥμ̄δ′ pro ἑκ. τεσσ. τεσσ. y: τεσσαρακοντατεσσ. uno accentu w **18** χρυσίον καθαρὸν] χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ w In u incipit folium (ut numeratur in Codice Vati-

cano) 266 ex verbis *καθαρὸν· ὅμοιον* (sic pro *ὁμοία*) *ὑαλῶ καθαρῶ. καὶ ὑάλωι y** sed superscr. *ε τῶ a* **19** *— τιμίῳ w* + *λίθοσ* post *δεύτεροσ w* *χαλκηδών*] *καρχηδών u* **20** *πέμπτος κ.τ.λ.* per litteras exprimuntur in *y*, *ε΄*, *ϛ΄*, *ζ΄*, *ϟ΄ κ.τ.λ.* *σαρδώνυξ w* *σάρδιος*] *σαρδείων u* *βηρύλλιος w* *ἀμέθυσος wy* **21** *ιϐ* bis pro *δώδεκα wy* *ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος*] *ἵνα εἷσ καὶ ἕκαστοσ u* + *ὡσ* ante *ἐξ ἑνὸσ μαρ. w* *διαφανὴς*] *διαυγὴσ uwy* **23** *ἐν αὐτῇ*] *αὐτῇ* tantum *u*, *αὐτὴν wy* **24** *καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τῶν σωζ. ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτῆς περιπ.*] *καὶ περιπατήσουσι τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτὸσ αὐτῆσ. uw*; *καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τῶν σωζομένων· τῶι φωτὶ αὐτῆσ περιπατήσουσι· περὶ ὧν φησὶν·, καὶ περιπατήσουσι τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτὸσ αὐτῆσ y*, non distinctis videlicet textu et commentario *— καὶ τὴν τιμὴν wy* *αὐτῶν*] *τῶν ἔθνων u* **25** *πυλεῶνεσ y* **27** *κοινοῦν*] *κοινὸν uwy* *— καὶ w* *ποιοῦν*] *ποιῶν u* *ψεῦδοσ*] *ψέυδουσ u*. Mox *ζ* in *ζωῆσ* est in rasura.

XXII **1** *καθαρὸν ποταμὸν*] *ποταμὸν καθαρὸν wy*, *ποταμὸν* tantum *u* **2** In *uwy* novus paragraphus incipit ex verbis *καὶ τοῦ ποτ.* *καρποὺς*] *καρπὸν. y*. Est punctum etiam post *μῆνα*, non post *δώδεκα* (*ξυλον ζωῆς ποιοῦν καρπὸν. δώδεκα κατὰ μῆνα.*) *ιϐ* pro *δώδεκα w* *μῆνα ἕνα ἕκαστον ἀποδιδοῦν*] *μῆνα ἕκαστον ἀποδιδοὺσ w*, *μῆνα ἀποδιδοὺσ ἕκαστον u* **3** *κατανάθεμα*] *κατάθεμα uwy* *ἔτι*] *ἐκεῖ y* **5** *ἐκεῖ*] *ἔτι u* *χρείαν οὐκ ἔχουσι λύχνου καὶ*] Ita *y*: *χρείαν οὐκ ἔχουσι φῶσ λύχνου καὶ w*, *οὐ χρείαν οὐκ ἔχουσι* (omisso *λύχνου*) *u* *φωτὸσ*] *φῶσ wy* *φωτίζει*] *φωτιεῖ ἐπ᾽ u*, *αὐτὸσ φωτιεῖ y* *βασιλεύσουσιν*] *βασιλεύσει w* **6** *εἶπέ*] *λέγει u* In *y* est rasura post *οὗτοι* *λόγοι*] *λόγοι μου u*, *λόγοι μοι w* Post *πιστοὶ*, *w* habet tamquam textus partem *ὡς ἐκ τῆσ ἀληθείασ προφητευόμενοι* + *τῶν πν̄ω̄ν* ante *τῶν ἁγίων u* *δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις*] *διδάξαι τοὺς δούλουσ w* **7** + *καὶ* ante *ἰδοὺ uw* **8** *Καὶ ἐγὼ*] *κἀγὼ u* *βλέπων ταῦτα καὶ ἀκούων*] *βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα wy*, *ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα u* *ἔβλεψα*] *εἶδον u* *ἔπεσα*] *ἔπεσον w*; in *y* nescio utrum *ἔπεσον* an *ἔπεσα* in alterum correctum fuerit *μοι*] *μου* ut videtur *y* **9** *ὅρα μή·*] *μὴ ὅρα. w*, *ὅρα· μὴ u* *— γὰρ uwy* *— καὶ* ante *τῶν τηρ. y* **10** *σφραγίσῃς*] *σφραγίσαι w* *ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς*] *ὁ*

γὰρ καιρὸς *w*, ὁ καιρὸσ γὰρ *u* **11** + καὶ ante ὁ ἀδικῶν *u* καὶ ὁ ῥυπ. ῥυπ. ἔτι] καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρόσ ῥυπαρευθήτω ἔτι *wy*: *u* haec prorsus omittit δικαιωθήτω] δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω *wy*: *y* habet *η* in ποιησάτω in rasura, ubi primo videtur scriptum esse *ει* — καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγ. ἔτι *w* **12** — καὶ ante ἰδοὺ *uw* ὡς τὸ ἔργον] κατὰ τὰ ἔργα *w* αὐτοῦ ἔσται] ἔσται αὐτοῦ *u*, αὐτοῦ tantum *w* **13** ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω,] ἐγὼ τὸ ᾱ καὶ τὸ ω̄ *y* et nonnullis compendiis *w*: ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ω̄ *u* ἀρχὴ... ἔσχ.] ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλοσ. ὁ πρώτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατοσ· *y* et addito οὔτε πρὸ ἐμοῦ οὔτε μετ' ἐμὲ θσ̄ ἐστιν *w*: ὁ πρῶτοσ καὶ ὁ ἔσχατοσ. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλοσ. + *u* **14** ἔσται ἡ ἐξ. αὐτῶν] ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἔσται *u* **15** — δὲ post ἔξω *uwy* οἱ πόρνοι] πόρναι *y* ὁ φιλῶν καὶ ποιῶν] ὁ ποιῶν καὶ ὁ φιλῶν *u* **16** ἐπὶ] Ita *y*: ἐν *w* τοῦ Δαβίδ] δ̄α̅δ̄ sine articulo *uwy* καὶ ὀρθρ.] ὁ πρωινός *wy*, ὁ προϊνὸσ ut videtur *u** **17** ἐλθὲ] ἔρχου bis *uwy* ἐλθέτω, καὶ] ἐρχέσθω *uwy* (omisso καὶ) λαμβανέτω τὸ] λαβέτω (omisso τὸ) *uw*, λαβεῖν *y* **18** Συμμ. γὰρ] μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ *uwy* + τῶ ante ἀκούοντι *u* ἐπιτιθ. πρ. ταῦτα, ἐπιθήσει] ἐπιθῆ ἐπ' ἀυτὰ. ἐπιθήσεται *u*, et, nisi quod -θεῖ pr. m., *y*, ἐπιθήσῃ ἐπ' αὐτὰ ἐπιθήσῃ *w* ὁ Θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν] ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὁ θσ̄ *y* αὐτὸν] αὐτῷ *w* + ἑπτὰ ante πληγὰς *y*. Pr. m., ut videtur, scripserat *ζ* et mox delevit, tertia ἑπτὰ inseruit + τῶ ante βιβλίω *uwy* **19** ἀφαιρῇ] ἀφέλη *uw*, ἀφελῆ *y* βίβλου τῆς προφ. ταύτης] τοῦ βιβλίου τῆσ προφ. ταύτησ *y*, τοῦ βιβλίου τῆσ προφ. tantum *u*, τῆσ προφητείασ τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου *w* ἀφαιρήσει] ἀφελεῖ *wy*, ἀφέλει *u* βίβλου] τοῦ ξύλου *uwy* — καὶ ante τῶν γεγρ. *uwy* + τῶ ante βιβλίῳ *uwy* **20** — ναὶ alterum *y*. In *u* ἀμὴν per puncta cum sequentibus conjunctum est, in *wy* cum praecedentibus + χε̄ post ἰῡ *wy* **21** — ἡμῶν *uwy* ὑμῶν] τῶν ἁγίων *uvwy* — ἀμήν *wy*: habet *v* et ut credo *u*.

W. H. SIMCOX.

ANNOTATIONS ON VALERIUS FLACCUS.

In an interesting and instructive paper, in *Hermathena*, vol. VIII, p. 393, Mr J. B. Bury remarks 'There is still a wide field for emendation in the poem of Valerius.' This observation, with which I entirely agree, may serve as an introduction to the following annotations which indeed are in the first instance an outcome of his paper.

Following the order of the books I first touch on

I 145 sqq.

fert grauis inuito uictorem Nestora tergo
Monychus; ardenti peragit Clanis Actora quercu;
nigro Nessus equo fugit, adclinisque tapetis
in mediis uacuo condit caput Hippasus auro.

Mr Bury rightly defends the text in 147, 148; but his interpretation of it '*auro* is a golden crater which Hippasus uses as a helmet' is not, I think, correct. In his picture of the fight between the Lapithae and the Centaurs Valerius follows Ovid or draws from the same source. The incidents are the same although, not unnaturally, some of the names are different. With l. 145 compare Ov. *Met.* XII 345 'tergoque Bienoris alti | insilit [Aegides] haud solito quemquam portare nisi ipsum,' with 146 *ib.* 271 'ecce rapit mediis flagrantem Rhoetus ab aris | pruniceum torrem dextraque a parte Charaxi | tempora perfringit fuluo protecta capillo' and 342 'mittentem *stipite querno* | occupat Aegides,' with 147 *ib.* 308 'ille etiam metuenti uulnera *Nesso* | 'ne *fuge*, ad Herculeos' inquit 'seruaberis arcus.'' It would appear that the parallel to 148 is to be sought in the death of Aphidas *ib.* 316 sqq. 'in tanto fremitu

ductis sine fine iacebat | sopitus uinis et inexperrectus Aphidas | languentique manu carchesia mixta tenebat, | fusus in Ossaeae uillosis pellibus ursae. | quem procul ut uidit frustra nulla arma mouentem, | inserit amento digitos 'miscenda'que dixit | 'cum Styge uina bibas, Phorbas'; nec plura moratus | in iuuenem torsit iaculum; ferrataque collo | fraxinus, ut casu iacuit resupinus, adacta est. | mors caruit sensu, plenoque e gutture *fluxit* | inque toros *in*que *ipsa* niger *carchesia sanguis.*' The difference between the two poets in the length of their descriptions is characteristic[1].

In the next line

ib. 149

haec quamquam miranda *uiris* stupet Aesone natus
et secum: 'heu miseros nostrum natosque patresque!'
et q. s.

Baehrens proposed 'nihil' for 'uiris,' Mr Bury 'nec—nimis' which is easier palaeographically but omits the necessary 'haec.' We should write *minus.*

ib. 271

omnibus *inde me* calor additus.

For *inde uiae,* the reading of V^2 and Vat. 1613, which Mr Bury rightly approves, compare Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 184 *τὸν δὲ παμπειθῆ γλυκὺν ἡμιθέοισιν πόθον ἔνδαιεν Ἥρα | ναὸς Ἀργοῦς μή τινα λειπόμενον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν.*

II 235 sqq.

diras aliae ad fastigia taedas
iniciunt *adduntque* domos. pars ignibus acti
effugiunt propere sed dura in limina coniunx
obsidet et uiso repetunt incendia ferro.

Burmann's suggestion, repeated by Prof. Ellis in *Journ. Phil.* IX p. 53, 'Possibly abduntque hide in smoke', involves a

[1] I see H. Köstlin, *Philologus* vol. 48. 653, compares the same passage, apparently however taking 'condit' of the sleeping Centaur's head falling over his wine-cup. This, though linguistically possible, seems to agree less well with the other incidents of the rout of the Centaurs selected for representation.

hardly admissible ellipse. 'clauduntque' is Mr Bury's proposal, and in sense this is right. But the true correction is *obduntque*, which I had set down before I was aware it was in the margin of the Bologna copy and printed in the Paris edition of 1517. For 'obdere domum' compare Apuleius *Met.* 5 9 p. 339.

ib. 410 sqq.

illic seruati genitoris conscia sacra
pressit acu currusque pios; stant saeua pauentum
agmina dantque locum: uiridi circum horrida tela
silua tremit; mediis refugit pater anxius umbris.
pars *et* frondosae raptus expresserat Idae
inlustremque fugam pueri.

On 414 Mr Bury writes 'Notwithstanding what Baehrens has said, *pars* may be right though it is rather odd.... Still Valerius might conceivably have written *pars expresserat* for *in parte* (*picturae*) *expressa sunt*.' Certainly he might, and have gone much further if he had chosen, as e.g. Propertius has done in describing another representation of art, the doors of Apollo's temple II 31 13 sq. 'altera deiectos Parnasi vertice Gallos, altera *maerebat* (= maeste expresserat) funera Tantalidos.' But a difficulty still remains; for 'pars' is without proper support, while 'et' is otiose. For 'et' *haec* should be read; 'haec,' written 'hec,' passed to 'et' by two of the most common errors in Latin manuscripts. 'haec' corresponds to 'illic' here, as 'hic' to 'hic' in a similar scene Virg. *A.* VI 25, 27. This is easy; but it is not easy to say why 'raptus' is attacked by Eyssenhardt, Baehrens and Mr Bury who respectively propose for it 'saltus,' 'tractus' and 'pastus.' If 'raptus Idae' cannot mean 'the rape *from* Ida,' what we may ask is the Latin genitive to be allowed to express? If it is the plural that is attacked, let 'reditūs' be denied to Regulus Hor. *Carm.* III 5 52. It is 'raptus' alone which makes 'fugam pueri' intelligible, otherwise a more appropriate expression for the flying son of Daedalus Juv. *Sat.* I 54.

III 120 sq.

talis in arma ruit, nec uina dapesque remotae
statque loco torus *in quo omen masere ministri.*

Prof. Ellis and Mr Bury rightly approve Baehrens' 'inque omen mansere'. But 'ministri' which the former interprets 'the servants did not move' (and were therefore of much less use than the celebrated automata of Daedalus) is absurd, and 'ministris', which the latter proposes, 'the servants...let things stand', is syntactically impossible. As the *m* of 'ministri' seems to have come from 'mansere', *sinistrum* (*-ū*) is a very easy correction.

ib. 212 sq.

perge age Tartareae mecum semel *omnia* noctis,
Musa, sequi.

Mr Bury reads 'sim*ul* (with the edd.) *ul*tima' and explains that *ul* fell out and that 'simultima' was corrected to 'semel omnia'. 'semel' for 'simul' however is quite a common confusion. For 'omnia' we should read '*inuia*' which, read *mnia*, could hardly fail to pass into 'omnia'. For the sense compare Virg. *Aen.* VI 154 'sic demum lucos *Stygios*, regna *inuia* uiuis, | adspicies'.

ib. 274 sq.

tunc super exangues *consertes* caedis aceruos
praecipiti plangore ruunt.

The subject is the unfortunate Cyzicenes recognising their countrymen whom the Minyae have slaughtered by mistake. The vulgate is 'confertae'; but Mr Bury proposes 'consortes' (nom.) 'the sharers in the carnage', in which I can find no appropriate sense. I take his word however and read *consortis*: 'consors caedes' is the same as 'consortium caedes'; compare Prop. I 21 1 'tu qui *consortem* properas euadere *casum*' and 'consortibus armis' Ov. *Met.* XI 865 (Housman).

ib. 645 sqq.

rursum instimulat ducitque fauentes
magnanimus Calydone satus; potioribus ille
deteriora fouens semperque inuersa tueri
durus et haud ullis umquam superabilis aequis
rectorumue memor 'non Herculis' inquit 'adempti'
et q. s.

The subject is Meleager who is intriguing to induce the Minyae to leave Hercules behind. Mr Bury would lop away from 'semperque' to 'memor' as 'an infelicitous interpolation'; and it must be admitted that 'aequis rectorumue' are not tolerable together. But there is no need for the knife if for 'rectorumue' we read '*actorumue*'. The sense is, Meleager soon forgot past services. The corruption was very easy in this connexion. *factorumue* might also be proposed in the sense of 'exploits' 'quis facta Herculeae non audit fortia clauae?' Prop. IV 9 39; but it appears less probable.

IV 674 sqq.

'sequor o quicumque deorum'
Aesonides uel *fallit* ait praecepsque fragores
per medios ruit.

Mr Bury rightly notes that 'uel fallit' is part of Jason's speech 'I follow whichever of the gods—even deceives me'; but the second person *fallis* should be taken with the Monacensis[1].

V 71 sq.

iam prora fretum commouerat et iam
puppe sedens ** dimiserat ancora terras.

For the lost word Mr Bury proposes 'tandem' which is somewhat weak. An epithet for 'terras' seems required, which has been variously supplied by 'tristes', 'maestas' and 'saeuas'. *diras* is more suitable than any of these (Valerius has 'dira—arua' in VII 206) and would more easily fall out after '*sedens*', which ends with practically the same letters, as $e = a$ and $n = ir$.

VI 256 sqq.

inpulit aduerso praeceps equus Onchea conto
nequiquam totis reuocantem uiribus armos
in latus; *accedit* sonipes *accedit* et ipse
frigidus; arma cadunt, rorat procul ultima cuspis:
qualem populeae fidentem nexibus umbrae
si quis auem summi deducat ab aere rami,

[1] Köstlin (*Philologus* vol. 39 p. 236) has already pointed out that thus person is required. He makes however the unnecessary change of 'nec' for 'uel'.

ante manu tacita cui plurima creuit harundo,
illa dolis uiscoque super correpta sequaci
inplorat ramos atque irrita concitat alas.

The poet is describing a death by one of the enormous *conti* of the Sarmatae. Oncheus is precipitated by his horse, which he attempts in vain to pull aside, upon the enormous pike. The comparison to a bird caught by the limed rod of the fowler is devoid of point unless the horseman is stuck on the pole. Hence such conjectures as those of Heinsius 'in latus adsedit sonipes, adsedit' and of Mr Bury (who further alters 'rorat') 'in latus ecce cadit, sonipes super accidit ipse frigidus' are useless. Baehrens' 'accepit...accepit' is right as far as it goes. But 'frigidus' is absurd; for no man is cold before his armour has fallen and while his blood is still dripping on the weapon which has killed him. I imagine that the beginning of the line has been injured and unskilfully restored, and that *-idus* represents *-ibus*, the termination of *ilibus*. It is no objection but rather a confirmation that in 243 we have 'inpacta latus inter et ilia quercu'; between III 263 and 280 Valerius uses 'exanguis' thrice. If the use of 'accepit' requires illustration, Virg. *A.* III 242 sq. 'sed neque uim plumis ullam neque uolnera tergo | accipiunt' and X 907 'haec loquitur iuguloque haud inscius accipit ensem' may be compared. I regret that Köstlin, whose punctuation I have adopted, has withdrawn his approval of Baehrens' correction, see *Philologus* vol. 39. 35 sqq. and 48. 666.

VII 333 sqq.

haec dicens qua non *uelocius* ulla
pestiferam toto nequiquam lumine lustrat
cunctaturque super morituraque colligit iras.

The frenzied Medea is revolving suicide. Baehrens reads 'qua non uelocius *herba* | pestifera est' which is too far from the MS. Mr Bury 'qua non ulla ocior' (*or* 'qua nil uelocius'), herbam | pestiferam' which is still further. They are both however independent witnesses to the appropriateness of

'pestifer[1].' I propose 'qua non *uis ocius* ulla | pestifera est.' The sense of 'uis' is the same as in 355 'et qua sibi fida magis uis | nulla, Prometheae florem de sanguine fibrae | Caucaseum,' a sentence moreover constructed exactly like our own.

ib. 504 sqq.

> tum me non tauros iuuet euasisse ferosque
> terrigenas, tum me tectis tua turbet in ipsis
> flamma tuaeque artes; nullus succurrere contra
> ingrato queat et *siquid tu* saeuius istis
> adicias meque in medio terrore relinquas.

Jason is invoking curses on himself if unfaithful to Medea. In place of 'tu', 'tibi' is generally accepted from Burmann. Mr Bury proposes 'quis' or 'scis.' 'tu' however is quite genuine, though one word out of its place; read 'et *tu, siquid* saeuius istis, | adicias.' *tu* is an emphatic climax. 'Then do you outdo your own dread magic and leave me to my terrors.' That a Latin writer would not have placed an emphatic pronoun in the middle of a *si* clause to which it did not belong, seems to me to be proved by a sentence like Sulpicia's [Tib.] III 17 (IV 11) 4 'non aliter tristes euincere morbos | optarim quam te si quoque uelle putem' where to us the emphatic order 'te si quoque' for 'si te q.' seems even a little unnatural.

J. P. POSTGATE.

[1] So also Köstlin *Philol.* vol. 39. 447; who reads 'qua non uelocius ulla | pestifera est' and explains 'ulla' as 'mors'! What a 'pestis mortifera' is, we know; but what (let the propounder of the riddle answer) is a 'mors pestifera'? ['*uis ocyor*' I now see has been conjectured by Heinsius. It may be that D'Orville's 'qua non uelocius ulla | *pestis erat*' is right.]

THE ESCORIAL EXCERPTS FROM *AETNA*.

BÄHRENS in his edition of the *Appendix Vergiliana* has used a set of excerpts from the *Aetna* and *Culex* contained in two MSS of the National Library at Paris, one of cent. XII/XIII, numbered 7647, the other, written in cent. XIII, numbered 17903. The variants of the former MS he calls p, those of MS 17903, n.

The library of the Escorial possesses a MS, Q. 1. 14, which among excerpts from a great variety of Latin authors, in prose and poetry alike, has some from the *Aetna* and *Culex*. Hartel describes this MS in his *Bibliotheca Patrum Hispaniensis*, p. 218, and assigns it to cent. XIII/XIV. It deserves more attention than it has yet obtained, were it only for the unusually large number of verses from the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus (p. 19). I counted 70 lines and half-lines, taken from I, II, IV, V, VI, VII: but want of time prevented my taking more exact note of these.

The *Aetna* and *Culex* excerpts agree closely with those of Bährens' two Paris MSS. I give the former first.

Virgilius in Ethna. Quam iocundum sit scientie non cupid itati operam dare.

1	Inmensus labor est sed fertilis idem	[222 Munro]
2	Digna laborantis respondent premia curis	[223]
3	Scire quot et que sint magno natalia mundo	[228]
4	Principia et rerum dubias exquirere causas	[229 + 226]
5	Solis scire modum et quanto minor orbita lune	[231]
6	Haec breuior cur bissenos cito peruolet orbes	[232]

7 Annuus ille meet quod [q'] certo sydera currant [233]
8 Ordine [*cett. omissa sunt*] [234]
9 Scire uices etiam signorum tradita cura est [235]
10 Nubila cur celo terris denuntiet imbres [236]
11 Quo cubeat [*sic*] phebe quo frater palleat igne [237]
12 Tempora cur uariant anni primaque iuuenta [238]
13 Ver estate perit cur estas ipsa senescit [239]
14 Autumpnoque obrepit hiems et in orbe recurrit [240]
15 Axem scire helices et tristem nosse cometem [241]
16 Lucifer unde micet · quaue hesperus · unde boetes [242]
17 Saturnique stella tenax quae [q̄] martia pugnax [243]
18 Quo rapiant naute quo sydere lintea tendant [244]
19 Scire uias maris et celi predicere cursus [245]
20 Quo uolet orion quo incubet index [246]
21 Et quocunque iacent tanto miracula mundo [247]
22 Non digesta pati nec aceruo condita rerum [248]
23 Sed manifesta notis certa disponere sede [249]
24 Singula diuina est animi ac iocunda uoluntas [250]
25 Non oculis solum pecudum miranda uidere [224]
26 More nec effusis in humum graue pascere corpus [225]

Conquestio quod maiorem demus operam augende pecunie quam scientie.

27 Torquemur miseri inprimis premimurque labore [257]
28 Vt sese pretio red[i]mant rerumque [*sic*] professe [258]
29 Turpe silent artes uiles inopesque relicte [259]
30 Torquentur flamma terre ferroque domantur [278]
31 Scrutamur rimas et uertimus omne profundum [276]
32 Semen ut argenti queratur et aurea uena [277]
33 Noctes atque dies festinant arua coloni [260]
34 Callent rure manus glebarum expellimur usu [261]
35 Fertilis haec segetique feratior altera uiti [262]
36 Hec platanis humus hec herbis dignissima tellus [263]
37 Hec dura et melior pecori · siluisque fidelis [264]
38 Aridiora tenent olee · succosior ulmis [265]
39 Grata leues crutiant animos et corpora sause [*sic*] [266]
40 Horrea uti saturent tumeant et dolia musto [267]
41 Plenaque desecto surgant fenilia campo [268]

It will be seen that these excerpts *rarely confirm the readings of the Gyraldinus.* For instance in 228 where *Gyr.* is reported to have had *fatalia,* Escor. gives *natalia* with C(ambridge): 232 *peruolat* Gyr., *peruolet* Esc. and C: 235 *signorum et tradita* Gyr., *signorum tradita* Esc. C: 236 *cur panope caelo* Gyr., *cur caelo terris* Esc. C: 238 *uer prima iuuenta* 239 *Cur* Gyr., *primaque iuuenta Ver* Esc. C: 244 *pandant* Gyr., *tendant* Esc. C: 246 *Qua uocet* Gyr., *Quo uolet* Esc. C: *excubet* Gyr., *incubet* Esc. C: 248 *congesta* Gyr., *digesta* Esc. C, where the true reading is probably *disiecta*: 224 *tueri* Gyr., *uidere* Esc., *fuere* C: 257 *terimurque* Gyr., *premimurque* Esc. C: 259[1] *humilesque iacent* Gyr., *silent artes uiles* Esc., *uiles taceant* C: 278 *Torrentur* Gyr., *Torquentur* Esc. C: 261 *glebarum expendimus usum* Gyr., *g. expellimur usu* Esc. C: 262 *segeti* Gyr., *segetique* Esc. C: 263 *plantis* Gyr., *platanis* Esc. C: 267 *Horreaque ut sature tumeant ut* Gyr., *Horrea uti saturent tumeant et* Esc. C.

There are however three cases in which Esc. agrees with Gyr. against C, 231 *et quanto minor orbita lunae* Gyr., *et quanto minor orbita lune* Esc., *et quanto minor orbita luna·est* C, in which we can hardly doubt that *lunaest* of C is the right and original reading, from which, probably through *luna ē,* rose *lunae,* then *lune*: 264 where Gyr. and Esc. agree in *Haec dura et* against *Haec diuiti et* C: 233 *Annuus ille meet* Esc. Gyr. against *Annuus ille monet* C.

It is enough for my purpose to be able to shew that in a vastly preponderating number of instances, the *reported* readings of Gyr. are at variance with the *extant* readings of C and Esc.: and that there are too many of these discrepances to admit of our lightly accepting Gyr. *against* Esc. and C.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

[1] This v. is given in C *Tum demum uiles taceant inopesque relictae.* From Gyr. is reported *humilesque iacent.* How is this possible if *Tum demum* preceded? On the other hand who would have noted down the half (*humilesque iacent*) without taking care to add the preceding half, in a case where, unless he did so, the v. would not scan?

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.

VOL. XXI. No. 41.

The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A.

INGRAM BYWATER, M.A.

AND

HENRY JACKSON, LITT. D.

London and Cambridge:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO. CAMBRIDGE.
1892

Price 4s. 6d.

CONTENTS. No. XLI.

	PAGE
NOTES ON PLUTARCH'S 'ETHICA.' W. R. PATON	1
THE NEW COLLEGE MS IN THE 'CUM PRINCIPIBUS PHILOSOPHANDUM ESSE.' W. R. P.	16
THE BRITISH MUSEUM PAPYRUS CXXVIII. WALTER LEAF	17
ON SOME FRAGMENTS OF AESCHYLUS, AND ON THE SUPPLICES. ROBINSON ELLIS	25
TWO NOTES ON SOPHOCLES. ROBINSON ELLIS	37
ΜΕΛΛΩ. ARTHUR PLATT	39
CATULLUS XI., HORACE ODES II. VI. ARTHUR PLATT	46
PALAEOGRAPHICA III. T. W. ALLEN	48
IMPERIUM CONSULARE AND PROCONSULARE. E. G. HARDY	56
A PROPERTIAN USE OF *Vnvs*. J. P. POSTGATE	66
THE FOUR GOSPELS AND THE FOUR ELEMENTS. C. TAYLOR	69
HERODOTUS II 121 §§ 11—17. JOHN E. B. MAYOR	70
NOTE ON THE PHILONEAN READING OF TWO PASSAGES IN THE TIMAEUS, 38 B AND 28 B. FRED. C. CONYBEARE	71
ON PARMENIDES 52 (60). HENRY JACKSON	73
VARIOUS CONJECTURES II. WALTER HEADLAM	75
THE MANUSCRIPTS OF PROPERTIUS (*to be continued*). A. E. HOUSMAN	101

Now ready, No. XLIX.

Demy 8vo. Price 4s. 6d.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

CONTENTS.

I. The Aryan Future. By EDWARD WASHBURN HOPKINS.
II. Prometheus and the Caucasus. By FREDERIC D. ALLEN.
III. Mood and Tense in the Subjunctive "Comparative" Clause in Latin. By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE.
IV. ΣΚΗΝΑΩ, ΣΚΗΝΕΩ, ΣΚΗΝΟΩ. By M. H. MORGAN.

Notes. Reviews and Book Notices. Reports.
Brief Mention. Recent Publication. Books Received.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

Now ready, 8vo.

No. I.—Parts I. and II., and No. II.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY ISAAC FLAGG, WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, AND BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER.

No. I. THE CUM-CONSTRUCTIONS: THEIR HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS.
Part I. Critical. By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE. Price 1s. 8d.
Part II. Constructive. Price 3s. 4d.

No. II. ANALOGY, AND THE SCOPE OF ITS APPLICATION IN LANGUAGE. By BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER. Price 1s. 3d.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

MACMILLAN'S CLASSICAL TRANSLATIONS.

ARISTOPHANES.—The Birds. Translated into English Verse. By B. H. KENNEDY, D.D. Cr. 8vo. 6*s.*

Help Notes to the Same, for the Use of Students. 1*s.* 6*d.*

ARISTOTLE.—The Metaphysics. Book I. Translated by a Cambridge Graduate. 8vo. 5*s.*

The Politics. Translated by Rev. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Headmaster of Harrow. Cr. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Rhetoric. Translated by the same. Cr. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Ethics. Translated by the same. Cr. 8vo. [*In the press.*

CICERO.—The Academics. Translated by J. S. REID, Litt.D., Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

HERODOTUS.—The History. Translated by G. C. MACAULAY, M.A. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 18*s.*

HOMER.—The Iliad. Translated into English prose by ANDREW LANG, M.A., WALTER LEAF, Litt.D., and ERNEST MYERS, M.A., Cr. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

The Odyssey. Done into English by S. H. BUTCHER, M.A., Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, and ANDREW LANG, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 6*s.*

HORACE.—Translated by J. LONSDALE, M.A., and S. LEE, M.A. Gl. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Studies, Literary and Historical, in the Odes of Horace. By A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

JUVENAL.—Thirteen Satires. Translated by ALEX. LEEPER, M.A., LL.D., Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne. Cr. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

LIVY.—Books I.–IV. Translated by Rev. H. M. STEPHENSON, M.A. [*In preparation.*

Books XXI.–XXV. Translated by A. J. CHURCH, M.A., and W. J. BRODRIBB, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

LONGINUS.—On the Sublime. Translated by H. L. HAVELL, B.A. With Introduction by ANDREW LANG. Cr. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

MELEAGER.—Fifty Poems of Meleager. Translated by WALTER HEADLAM. Fcap. 4to. 7*s.* 6*d.*

PAUSANIAS.—Description of Greece. Translated with Commentary by J. G. FRAZER, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. [*In preparation.*

PINDAR.—The Extant Odes of Pindar. Translated by ERNEST MYERS, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 5*s.*

PLATO.—The Republic of Plato. Translated by J. LL. DAVIES, M.A., and D. J. VAUGHAN, M.A. 18mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, and Phædo. Translated by F. J. CHURCH. 18mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Phædrus, Lysis, and Protagoras. Translated by J. WRIGHT, M.A. 18mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

POLYBIUS.—The Histories of Polybius. Translated by E. S. SHUCKBURGH, M.A. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 24*s.*

SALLUST.—Catiline and Jugurtha. Translated by A. W. POLLARD, B.A. Cr. 8vo. 6*s.*

The Catiline (separately). 2*s.*

SOPHOCLES.—Œdipus the King. Translated into English Verse by E. D. A. MORSHEAD, M.A., Assistant Master at Winchester. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

TACITUS.—The Annals. Translated by A. J. CHURCH, M.A., and W. J. BRODRIBB, M.A. With Maps. Cr. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The History. Translated by A. J. CHURCH, M.A., and W. J. BRODRIBB, M.A. With Map. Cr. 8vo. 6*s.*

The Agricola and Germany, with the Dialogue on Oratory. Translated by A. J. CHURCH, M.A., and W. J. BRODRIBB, M.A. With Maps. Cr. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

THEOCRITUS, BION, and MOSCHUS.—Translated by A. LANG, M.A. 18mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Also an Edition on Large Paper. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

VIRGIL.—Translated by J. LONSDALE, M.A., and S. LEE, M.A. Gl. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Æneid.—Translated by J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Cr. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

XENOPHON. Translated by H. G. DAKYNS, M.A. In four vols. Cr. 8vo. Vol. I., containing the "Anabasis" and Books I. and II. of "The Hellenica." 10*s.* 6*d.* With Maps and Plans. Vol. II. [*In the press.*

MACMILLAN'S CLASSICAL LIBRARY.

STANDARD GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS, EDITED, WITH INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES, FOR THE USE OF ADVANCED STUDENTS.

8vo. cloth.

ÆSCHYLUS.—The Supplices. A Revised Text, with Translation. By T. G. TUCKER, M.A., Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Melbourne. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Seven against Thebes. With Translation. By A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Agamemnon. With Translation. By A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D. 12*s.*

Agamemnon, Choephorœ, and Eumenides. By A. O. PRICKARD, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. [*In preparation.*

The Eumenides. With Verse Translation. By BERNARD DRAKE, M.A. 5*s.*

ANTONINUS, MARCUS AURELIUS.—Book IV. of the Meditations. With Translation. By HASTINGS CROSSLEY, M.A. 6*s.*

ARISTOTLE.—The Politics. By R. D. HICKS, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. [*In the press.*

An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric. With Analysis, Notes and Appendices. By E. M. COPE, Fellow and late Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. 14*s.*

The Sophistici Elenchi. With Translation. By E. POSTE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8*s.* 6*d.*

ATTIC ORATORS.—From Antiphon to Isaeos. By R. C. JEBB, Litt.D., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. 25*s.*

BABRIUS.—With Lexicon. By Rev. W. G. RUTHERFORD, M.A., LL.D., Headmaster of Westminster. 12*s.* 6*d.*

CICERO.—The Academica. By J. S. REID, Litt.D., Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge. 15*s.*

EURIPIDES.—Medea. Edited by A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Iphigenia in Aulis. Edited by E. B. ENGLAND, M.A. 7*s.* 6*d.*

HERODOTUS.—Books I.–III. The Ancient Empires of the East. Edited by A. H. SAYCE, Deputy-Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford. 16*s.*

Books IV.–IX. Edited by R. W. MACAN, M.A., Reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. [*In preparation.*

HOMER.—The Iliad. By WALTER LEAF, Litt.D. Books I.–XII. 14*s.* Books XIII.–XXIV. 14*s.*

HORACE.—Studies, Literary and Historical, in the Odes of Horace. By A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D. 8*s.* 6*d.*

KTESIAS.—The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias. By JOHN GILMORE, M.A. 8*s.* 6*d.*

MARTIAL.—Books I. and II. of the Epigrams. By Professor JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A. [*In the press.*

PHRYNICHUS.—The New Phrynichus; being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus. With Introduction and Commentary by Rev. W. G. RUTHERFORD, M.A., LL.D., Headmaster of Westminster. 18*s.*

PINDAR.—The Nemean Odes. By J. B. BURY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. 12*s.*

The Isthmian Odes. By the same. 10*s.* 6*d.*

PLATO.—Phædo. By R. D. ARCHER-HIND, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Phædo. By W. D. GEDDES, LL.D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Timaeus. With Translation. By R. D. ARCHER-HIND, M.A. 16*s.*

PLAUTUS.—The Mostellaria. By WILLIAM RAMSAY, M.A. Edited by G. G. RAMSAY, M.A., Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow. 14*s.*

PLINY.—Correspondence with Trajan. C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi Epistulæ ad Traianum Imperatorem cum Eiusdem Responsis. By E. G. HARDY, M.A. 10*s.* 6*d.*

TACITUS.—The Annals. By G. O. HOLBROOKE, M.A., Professor of Latin in Trinity College, Hartford, U.S.A. With Maps. 16*s.*

The Histories. By Rev. W. A. SPOONER, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. With Introductions. 16*s.*

THUCYDIDES.—Book IV. A Revision of the Text, Illustrating the Principal Causes of Corruption in the Manuscripts of this Author. By Rev. W. G. RUTHERFORD, M.A., LL.D., Headmaster of Westminster. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Book VIII. By H. C. GOODHART, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh. [*In the press.*

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.